arXiv:1002.1172v2 [gr-qc] 2 Nov 2011

Stationary solutions and asymptotic flatness.

Martin Reiris.[1]

Max Planck Institute für Gravitationasphysik.
(Albert Einstein Institut).
Germany.

Abstract.

Consider a complete end of a four dimensional strictly stationary solution of the vacuum Einstein equations homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3$ minus a ball. We prove that the end is asymptotically flat with the standard Kerr-type of fall off if and only if the metric $g = |X|^2\tilde{g}$ is complete, where $\tilde{g}$ is the quotient three-metric, $\mathbf{g}$ is the space-time metric, X is the time-like stationary Killing field and $|X|^2 := -< X, X >_{\mathbf{g}}$. In particular the end is asymptotically flat if $|X|^2 \geq c > 0$. The proof is based on Anderson's a priori curvature estimates and a volume comparison on the conformally related space on which the non-metric part of the Einstein equations take the form of the harmonic Ernst map into the hyperbolic plane. The Kaluza-Klein monopoles show that a similar statement is false in higher dimensions. Moreover the statement is false in the presence of matter even in dimension four, for there exist spherically symmetric, static, perfect fluid solutions (with positive energy density and pressure) in hydrostatic equilibrium and whose asymptotic is isothermal and therefore not asymptotically flat. The result above originated while studying the isothermal asymptotic of dark halos in spiral galaxies. We discuss this genesis.

---

[1] e-mail: martin@aei.mpg.de

Contents

1 Introduction. **2**

1.1 The setup and the main result. 5

1.2 The Ernst representation and overview of the main arguments. 8

1.3 A physical motivation: the quest on the nature of dark halos. 12

2 Background material. **17**

2.1 Notation 17

2.2 The Bishop-Gromov volume comparison. 19

2.3 Remarks on the Cheeger-Gromov theory of Riemannian convergence. 21

2.4 Elliptic estimates for stationary solutions. 22

2.5 Anderson's a priori curvature decay. 22

2.6 Definition and structure of limit annuli. 23

3 Proof of the main result. **29**

3.1 Cubic volume growth and weak asymptotic flatness. 29

3.2 Strong asymptotic flatness (Kerr-type of decay). 39

4 Appendix **49**

5 Acknowledgements. **53**

1 Introduction.

A common physical assumption (deeply rooted in our way of thinking) is that the final state in the evolution of a bounded and isolated system, even cosmological, is always stationary and asymptotically flat. This sometimes automatic assumption underlies the basic a priori hypothesis of asymptotic flatness usually made on a wide range of physical phenomena even phenomena arising in a cosmological context.

In relation to this, we will prove a result that could be interpreted as saying that, if the final state of a bounded and isolated physical system is stationary then it must be asymptotically flat and must have a Kerr-type of fall off. In this sense a physical system cannot be in stationary equilibrium at infinity if it fails to be asymptotically flat or enjoying a Kerr-type of fall off.

In a mathematical statement we prove that, if the quotient of (some region of) the space-time manifold by the (time-like) stationary killing field X is homeomorphic to

$\mathbb{R}^3$ minus a ball and the metric $g := |X|^2\tilde{g}$ is complete, where $\tilde{g}$ is the quotient three-metric, and $|X|$ is the (absolute) space-time norm of X, then the region is asymptotically flat with a Kerr-type of fall off (Theorem 1). A simple and important instance where the result applies is the following. If the physical metric $\tilde{g}$ is complete and the norm $|X|$ of the stationary Killing field remains away from zero outside a compact set, namely satisfies $|X| \geq c > 0$, then g is complete and (by Theorem 1) the stationary solution is asymptotically flat and with a Kerr-type of fall off. Here and in the rest of the article, a closed manifold with smooth boundary in a smooth Riemannian manifold is "complete" if it is complete as a metric space (i.e. with respect to the metric induced by the Riemannian metric). In particular inextensible geodesics are either of infinite length or end at the boundary of the set.

The metric g has been used extensively in the literature of stationary solutions, and it is not accident that a comprehensive result as Theorem 1 is phrased in terms of it. As seen from the metric g and further components of the space-time metric, the vacuum stationary solutions satisfy a rather rigid set of equations with a remarkable internal structure (equations (9)-(12)). This structure is not explicit if the metric $\tilde{g}$ is used instead of g. We will explain the advantages of using g in detail in Section 1.2. Note that from a local point of view, both representations of the stationary solution, namely using $\tilde{g}$ or rather g, are equivalent. However on a global perspective such equivalence may be lost. For instance certain region may be complete with one of the metrics but not with the other. In this sense the assumption of the completeness of g is a priori necessary even under the rather basic and natural assumption of the completeness of $\tilde{g}$. It is an open question, whether there are stationary solutions on a region homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3$ minus a ball, where $\tilde{g}$ is complete, but g is not. If such a solution exists then $|X|$ must fall faster than the inverse of the $\tilde{g}$-distance (to the boundary of the region), over a $\tilde{g}$-divergent sequence of points.

To our knowledge two results in the literature relate directly to the present work. In [9], Kennefick and O'Murchadha have shown using an elliptic bootstrap of decay that (see [9] for a precise statement in terms of Sobolev weighted spaces) if there is a coordinate system where we have the decay $|\partial_k(\delta_{ij} - g_{ij})| \leq |\overline{x}|^{-k-\epsilon}$, for $k = 0, 1, 2$, $\epsilon > 0$, then the stationary solution has a Kerr-type of fall off ($\epsilon = 1$). Kennefick and O'Murchadha interpreted this as: "any departure from a Kerr-type of decay in an initial state must be due to the existence of gravitational radiation near space-like infinity". This point will come out again somehow in the Physical Motivations in Section 1.3. We will make use of [9] later, but we remark that our result is widely more general in that it does not presuppose any particular asymptotic, nor of course, the existence of coordinates systems of a special kind. The second work worth mentioning, due to M. Anderson, precisely goes farther in this respect and relaxes the a priori asymptotic at infinity still concluding asymptotic flatness. More concretely in [3] M. Anderson gave geometric conditions on ends of *static solutions* (note that staticity and not stationarity is assumed) of no particular topology, that guarantee asymptotic flatness (see Theorem 0.3, pg 999). Our result, although qualitatively different, follows the same spirit.

The statement of Theorem 1 is not generalizable to higher dimensions. Indeed already in dimension five the Kaluza-Klein monopole is an example of a static metric having a Ricci-flat four-dimensional hypersurface homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^4$ which is asymptotically locally flat but not asymptotically flat. The explicit form is given by

$$g_{KK} = -dt^2 + g_{TN},$$
$$g_{TN} = (1 + \frac{m}{r})dr^2 + (1 + \frac{m}{r})r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 d\phi^2) + m^2\frac{1}{(1 + \frac{m}{r})}(d\psi + \cos\theta d\phi)^2$$

where g_{TN} is the Taub-NUT Ricci-flat instanton on $\mathbb{R}^4$. Consider the spheres $S^3(r)$ of constant radius r, endowed with the scaled metric

$$h_r = (1 + \frac{m}{r})(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) + m^2\frac{1}{r^2(1 + \frac{m}{r})}(d\psi + \cos\theta d\phi)^2$$

(the inherited metric on $S^3(r)$ from g_{TN} and scaled by $1/r^2$). As $r \to \infty$ the geometry collapses into a two-dimensional round sphere by metrically collapsing the Hopf fibration (along ψ). This particular phenomenon of collapse over the three-sphere simply does not occur over the two-sphere, and this impossibility is, in a certain sense, crucial in the proof of Theorem 1. In this sense it is this what makes the space-time dimension four (in vacuum) differ drastically from higher space-time dimensions.

Theorem 1 is neither generalizable to include matter, even in dimension four and under physically acceptable matter models. Indeed, there exist self similar, spherically symmetric, static, perfect fluid solutions, with positive energy and pressure densities, in hydrostatic equilibrium and whose asymptotic is isothermal and therefore not asymptotically flat. By isothermal we mean that the density of energy and pressure ρ, p, and therefore by the energy constraint the scalar curvature R, decay quadratically, namely $\rho = \rho_0/r^2$, $p = p_0/r^2$, $R = R_0/r^2$ (where r is a coordinate radius proportional to the distance to the origin). In explicit form the space-time metric is given by

$$\mathbf{g} = -r^{2v^2}dt^2 + \frac{1}{1-8\pi\rho_0}dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2.$$

where $v(\rho_0)$ (see later) is the velocity of rotation of free-falling bodies in circular orbit (around the origin). We will be studying this metric in detail in Section 1.3. Note that contrary to the Kaluza-Klein monopole, there is no collapse at spatial infinity (there cannot be) rather there is a defect in the solid angle at infinity which is intimately related to ρ_0 and v (see Section 1.3). An angle defect like this can be ruled out to occur in vacuum (see Corollary 1). In the regime of low rotational velocities $v \approx 0$, this solution reduces, in a suitable limit, to the so called *singular isothermal model* widely used in galactic dynamics and representing collision-less Vlasov matter in thermal equilibrium.

The result of this article originated in the geometric investigation of the *isothermal asymptotic* of dark halos in spiral galaxies. Precisely, but shortly, we investigated up to which extent could dark halos energy's be accounted to gravitation. The inevitable conclusion reached from our results here is : *Granted General Relativity to be correct and granting a stationary regime of the halo of actual spirals, then the dark halo energy density cannot be accounted solely to gravitation.* We will be explaining these conclusions further in Section 1.3.

The article is divided in three sections. The precise statements of the results are given in Section 1.1 (below) and a discussion of the main arguments of the proof is given in Section 1.2. In Section 1.3 we make a discussion of the physical inputs which motivated this work. In Section 2 background material and important basic techniques used in the proof of the main result are introduced and discussed. The proof itself in Section 3 is divided into two parts. In Section 3.1 it is proved "weak asymptotic flatness" (Theorem 2) and then in Section 3.2 a refined description of the asymptotic is obtained that gives "strong asymptotic flatness", that is Kerr-type of decay. This finishes the article.

1.1 The setup and the main result.

Formally, a stationary solution of the Einstein vacuum equations is a smooth four manifold $\mathbf{M}$ and a smooth Lorentzian metric $\mathbf{g}$, such that there exists a one parameter group $G \approx \mathbb{R}$ of isometries with timelike and non-closed orbits. The action of the group G is generated by the timelike stationary vector field X. The quotient space

$M = \mathbf{M}/_G$ is a smooth 3-manifold that we will assume is closed (as set) and with (possibly empty) boundary. We can think thus $\mathbf{M}$ as the principal $\mathbb{R}$-bundle

$$\mathbb{R} \to \mathbf{M} \overset{\pi}{\to} M.$$

The metric $\mathbf{g}$ naturally projects into a smooth 3-metric $\tilde{g}$ in M (namely, for any v_1 and v_2, tangent vectors at p and perpendicular to X, we have $\tilde{g}(\pi_* v_1, \pi_* v_2) = \mathbf{g}(v_1, v_2)$).

From [2] it is known that if $(M, \tilde{g})$ is complete and boundary-less then it must be a quotient of the Minkowski spacetime. Then, if complete, the space M of a non-trivial stationary and solution, must have a non-trivial boundary ∂M.

Definition 1 *A stationary solution* $(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{g})$ *has regular ends*[2] *if there is a compact set* $\mathcal{K}$ *such that* $M \setminus \mathcal{K} \approx \cup_{i=1}^{i=m} E_i$, *where*

1. *The union before is disjoint and every connected component* E_i *is homeomorphic to* $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$ *(from now on* B *will be an open ball in* $\mathbb{R}^3$*).*
2. *Making* $g = |X|^2 \tilde{g}$*, then every* (E_i, g) *is, as a metric space, complete. We have used* $|X|^2 := - < X, X >_{\mathbf{g}}$.

Consider the dual form ξ to X, i.e. $\xi(v) =< X, v >_{\mathbf{g}}$. With this, the twist potential is defined as usual by

$$\omega = \frac{1}{2} \star (\xi \wedge d\xi),$$

where $\star$ is the Hodge star on $(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{g})$. We will use the notation u for $u^2 := |X|^2$, $u > 0$. With $\tilde{g}, \xi$ and u one can represent the space-time metric as

$$\mathbf{g} = -\frac{\xi \otimes \xi}{u^2} + \pi^* \tilde{g},$$

It is easy to check that $\omega(X) = 0$ and that $X(u) = 0$. Thus ω and u descend into M. The Einstein vacuum equations imply the following system in $(M, (\tilde{g}, \omega, u))$ (see [14] and [2] for a presentation in the context of this article)

---

[2] An *end* is defined as a complete and non-compact manifold, such that outside any compact set there is only one unbounded component.

$$Ric_{\tilde{g}} = \frac{1}{u}\nabla^2_{\tilde{g}} u + \frac{2}{u^4}(w\otimes w - |w|^2_{\tilde{g}}\tilde{g}), \tag{1}$$

$$\Delta_{\tilde{g}} u = -\frac{2}{u^3}|w|^2_{\tilde{g}}, \tag{2}$$

$$div_{\tilde{g}}\ w = 3 < \nabla_{\tilde{g}} \ln u, w >_{\tilde{g}}, \tag{3}$$

$$dw = 0. \tag{4}$$

The variables $(\tilde{g},\omega,u)$ have all the necessary information to reconstruct the space-time metric $\mathbf{g}$ at each end. Writing $\mathbf{E} = E\times\mathbb{R}$, and $\xi = -u^2(dt+\theta)$ with θ a 1-form in $\mathbf{E}$ we have $d\theta = -*2w/u^4$, where $*$ is the Hodge-star on (E,g). From this the full end $(\mathbf{E},\mathbf{g})$ can be found.

Under this setup, the next is the main theorem we will prove.

Theorem 1 *Let $(E,(\tilde{g},\omega,u))$ be a regular end of a stationary solution. Then there is a coordinate system $\{\overline{x} = (x_1,x_2,x_3)\}$, such that, the metric $\tilde{g}$ is asymptotically flat, namely*

$$|\delta_{ij} - g_{ij}| \leq \frac{c}{|\overline{x}|}, \tag{5}$$

$$|\partial_k g_{ij}| \leq \frac{c}{|\overline{x}|^2}. \tag{6}$$

and we have the fall offs

$$|Ric_{ij}| \leq \frac{c}{|\overline{x}|^3}, \tag{7}$$

$$|\partial_i u| + |\omega_i| \leq \frac{c}{|\overline{x}|^2}, \tag{8}$$

plus further progressive decay for the norm of the derivatives $\partial_m Ric_{ij}$, $\partial_m\partial u$, $\partial_m\omega_i$, $i,j = 1,2,3$, $m = 1,2,\ldots,\infty$.

Remark 1 *The explicit use of coordinates in the statement of Theorem 1 is not at all necessary (it could not be). Its mention is just to stress that, at the end, the result refers to a standard definition of asymptotic flatness. In fact we will not necessitate or use coordinates in any form in this article. All the argumentation is in geometrical terms.*

The route to prove Theorem 1 consists in working in the variables $(E,(g,\omega,\ln u))$, prove asymptotic flatness and decay, and then return to the variables $(E,(\tilde{g},\omega,u))$ to obtain directly the result. As it was said the variables $(E,(g,\omega,\ln u))$ have quite a number of remarkable properties, which make the problem geometrically tractable. A discussion of the stationary equations in these “Ernst” variables, as well as an elaboration of the arguments leading to the proof of Theorem 1 is given in the next section.

1.2 The Ernst representation and overview of the main arguments.

In this section we introduce the “Ernst” set up of the reduced (by the stationary Killing field) Einstein equations (see [14]). After that we give the main elements of the proof of the main result. The development of the arguments are given in Section 3. A complete account of the notation and further notions used here can be found in full detail in Section 2.

As we said, we will work with the conformally related metric $g = u^2\tilde{g}$ and as we will explain below, this conformal change transforms the non-metric part of the Einstein equations into the equations of a harmonic map (the Ernst map) into the hyperbolic plane. This particular representation of the Einstein equations, extensively used in the literature of Black holes, will be also of fundamental importance here. The Einstein equations (1)-(4) in the variables $(g,w,\ln u)$ ([14] or [2] for a presentation in the context of this article)) are

$$Ric = 2\nabla\ln u\otimes\nabla\ln u + \frac{2}{u^4}\omega\otimes\omega, \tag{9}$$

$$\Delta\ln u = -\frac{2}{u^4}|\omega|^2, \tag{10}$$

$$div\ \omega = 4 < \nabla\ln u,\omega >, \tag{11}$$

$$d\omega = 0. \tag{12}$$

As we see in what follows, they enjoy quite a number of remarkable properties. The first to observe, and which will be used all through, is that these equations are invariant under the simultaneous scalings $(g,\omega,u)\rightarrow(\lambda^2 g,\mu^2\omega,\mu u)$, for any $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$. Secondly, these equations are the Euler-Lagrange equations for the action

$$\mathcal{S} = \int R - \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\nabla u^2|^2 + |\nabla\phi|^2}{u^4}dV.$$

and it is apparent from here that the non-metric equations (10)-(12) are the equations for the harmonic map $\mathcal{E}:(E,g)\rightarrow(H,g_H)$, $\mathcal{E}(p)=(2\phi,u^2)$, where $2d\phi = w$, $H=\mathbb{R}^{2+}$ and $g_H = (dx^2+dy^2)/y^2$ is the hyperbolic metric in the half space-model of the hyperbolic plane. We note now that in the last section and just for simplicity, we will use the single Ernst equation for the complex potential $\mathcal{E} = u^2 + 2i\phi$

$$\Delta\mathcal{E} = 2\frac{<\nabla\mathcal{E},\nabla\mathcal{E}>}{\mathcal{E}+\bar{\mathcal{E}}}. \tag{13}$$

instead of the system (10)-(12).

Continuing with the discussion we have

$$Ric = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}^*(g_H),$$

while the energy density of the Ernst map $\mathcal{E}$ is

$$e(\mathcal{E}) = R = \frac{1}{2}tr_g\mathcal{E}^*(g_H).$$

The scalar curvature R_g is subharmonic, as can be seen from the crucial inequality

$$\Delta R \geq R^2, \tag{14}$$

which is deduced from the Bochner formula for harmonic maps (see [2] and references therein)

$$\Delta e(\mathcal{E}) = |\nabla D\mathcal{E}|^2 + <Ric,\mathcal{E}^*(g_H)> - \sum_{i,j=1}^{3}\mathcal{E}^*Rm_{g_H}(e_i,e_j,e_j,e_i),$$

after observing that

$$2|Ric|^2 \geq R^2 \geq |Ric|^2,$$

$$<Ric,\mathcal{E}^*(g_H)>= 2|Ric|^2,$$

$$-\sum_{i,j=1}^{3}\mathcal{E}^*Rm_{g_H}(e_i,e_j,e_j,e_i) = 4(R^2 - |Ric|^2).$$

Note that from the metric equation (9) we obtain $|\nabla\mathcal{E}|^2 = Ru^4/2$.

Another noticeable property of equation (9) is that the Ricci tensor is explicitly non-negative. This central fact allows a standard Bishop-Gromov volume comparison to the Euclidean 3-space. Indeed following a quite standard technique we show in Section 2 (the well known statement) that

$$\frac{Vol_g(U(\partial E,r))}{r^3}, \tag{15}$$

where $U(\partial E, r)$ is the set of points at a distance less or equal than r from ∂E, is monotonically decreasing as r increases[3]. We will denote by $\mu(\partial E)(\geq 0)$ to the limit of this quotient as r goes to plus infinity. To make this volume comparison useful we need to appeal to the a priori curvature decay [2]

$$|Ric| + 2|\nabla \ln u|^2 + 2\frac{|\omega|^2}{u^4} \leq 2R \leq \frac{c}{d^2}. \tag{16}$$

where $d = d(p) = dist_g(p, \partial E)$. It implies, in particular, that the Ricci curvature of the rescaled metric $g_r := \frac{1}{r^2}g$ is uniformly bounded on every annulus $A_k(r) := A(2^{-k}r, 2^k r)$ (for every fixed natural number $k > 0$), namely the set of points at a g-distance from ∂E between $2^{-k}r$ and $2^k r$. If the limit $\mu(\partial E)$ is zero, then applying the standard Cheeger-Gromov-Fukaya theory of volume collapse under curvature and diameter bounds, we show that, outside a compact set, the end can be realized as the union along boundary 2-tori of Seifert manifolds with at least two boundary components each (Lemma 4 after Lemma 3 and Propositions 7,8). It is standard [13] that such manifolds are irreducible and thus every embedded 2-sphere bounds a ball. This contradicts the fact the the end is topological of the form $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}^+$. Thus we must have $\mu(\partial E) > 0$ (Lemma 4). Having proved this we use the standard Cheeger-Gromov theory of convergence (see Section 2.3) to obtain that the limit of (of a subsequence of) the annuli $(A(2^k r, 2^{-k}r)), g_r)$ exists. Denote it by $(A_k(\infty), g_\infty)$. From the stationarity of the quotient (15) in the limit space we deduce in Section 2.6 that

1. the limit of the rescaled distance function, namely $d_\infty := lim_{r\rightarrow\infty}\frac{d}{r}$ is smooth (Proposition 5),
2. the level sets of $\{d_\infty = \tau, \tau \in (2^{-k}, 2^k)\}$ is a fotiation of $A_k(\infty)$ by 2-spheres $\{S(\tau)\}$ (Proposition 6),
3. the mean curvature θ of the sphere $\{d_\infty = \tau\}$ is $\theta = 2/\tau$ (Proposition 6),
4. the second fundamental form $\Theta(\tau)$ of the sphere $\{d_\infty = \tau\}$ is $\Theta = (1/\tau)h(\tau)$, where $h(\tau)$ is the induced metric on the sphere (Proposition 6).
5. the normal component of Ric_{g_∞} at every sphere $\{d_\infty = \tau\}$ is equal to zero (Proposition 6).

We show next that, after suitably rescaling (depending on r) of ω and u if necessary (to new variables denoted by ω_r and u_r), the limit of (a subsequence of) $(A_k(r), (g_r, \omega_r, \ln u_r))$

---

[3] $f(x)$ is monotonically decreasing (increasing) iff $f(x_1)) \geq (\leq) f(x_2)$ if $x_1 \leq x_2$.

exists. Denote it by $(A_k(\infty), (g_\infty, \omega_\infty, \ln u_\infty))$. To prove that this limit is a flat stationary solution (Corollary 1) it is noted that, because of the *items 4,5* above and equation (9) we have

$$g_\infty = d\tau^2 + \tau^2 h(1),$$
$$n_\infty(\ln u_\infty) = 0,\ (n_\infty = \nabla d_\infty).$$

and therefore over every sphere $S(\tau)$ we have $\Delta_{g_\infty} \ln u = \Delta_{h(\tau)} \ln u$. Using this information in equation (10) and integrating over $S(\tau)$ we get that $\omega_\infty = 0$ over each $S(\tau)$ and therefore all over the limit annulus. We also get that $\ln u_\infty$ is constant over every $S(\tau)$, but as it is constant too on radial directions we deduce that $\ln u_\infty$ is constant all over the limit annulus. From equation (9) we finally deduce that g_∞ is flat. A standard use of the structure equations in Riemannian geometry proves that the Gaussian curvature κ of every leaf is $1/\tau^2$, therefore the limit $(A_k(\infty), g_\infty)$ is just a standard annulus in Euclidean space. This shows that the ends $(E, (g, \omega, \ln u))$ have to be *weakly asymptotically flat* in the sense that $\lim Vol_g(U(\partial E, r))/r^3 = 4\pi/3$ and $|Ric|_g \leq o(d)/d^2$ where $o(d) \to 0$ as $d \to \infty$. This “ weak asymptotic flatness” given in Theorem 2 is our first central result of the article. Still further work is required to prove *strong asymptotic flatness*, that is, Kerr-type of decay. We discuss more on that below.

In [9] it was proved (essentially) that if $|Ric|_g \leq c/d^{2+\epsilon}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ then, after a straightforward bootstrapping, the solution must have indeed the standard decay. The question whether a weak notion of asymptotic flatness is enough to conclude the standard decay or not was stated but left open (*Remark* 2, pg 155 [9]). We prove it here. To do that we argue by contradiction appealing strongly to the sub-harmonic property of R and the Ernst equation to conclude in Lemma 5 and after several preliminary propositions that for any $\eta > 0$ there is $c(\eta) > 0$ such that

$$R \leq \frac{c(\eta)}{d^{4-\eta}}.$$

This estimate plus the construction of coordinates at infinity in [4] and the observed bootstrapping in [9] combine to imply the falloff

$$R \leq \frac{c}{d^4}.$$

Undoing the conformal transformation we get the standard decay stated in Theorem 1 for the variables $(g, w, \ln u)$. Besides Lemma 5 we will not include further details on this point and we point the reader to [9] and [4] for further details.

1.3 A physical motivation: the quest on the nature of dark halos.

The Theorem 1 is false in the presence of matter. Indeed, there are static, spherically symmetric, perfect fluid solutions (of positive energy density and pressure) with *isothermal density profile*, roughly meaning by this that the densities of energy and pressure have quadratic decay. Such quadratic decay forbids asymptotic flatness, even in the weakest sense of *item 1* in Theorem 1, and therefore violates the conclusion of Theorem 1. Solutions of this kind where first given formally by Tolman in [15] and have appeared in diverse contexts in the astrophysical literature. To make the exposition of the article comprehensive we provide their construction below. Consider a spherically symmetric, perfect fluid solution of the static Einstein equations. Write the space-time metric as

$$\mathbf{g} = -e^{2\phi(r)}dt^2 + h(r)dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2,$$

and the energy-momentum tensor as $T = \rho(r) u\otimes u + p(r)(u\otimes u + \mathbf{g})$, where $u =< n, >_{\mathbf{g}}$ and n is the normal field to the static foliation. The functions ϕ and h are set through [17]

$$\phi' = \frac{m(r) + 4\pi r^3 p}{r(r-2m(r))},$$

$$h(r) = \frac{1}{(1-\frac{2m(r)}{r})},$$

where

$$m(r) = 4\pi \int^r \rho(\bar{r}) d\bar{r}. \tag{17}$$

Thus, to specify the solution it is sufficient to know $\rho(r)$ and $p(r)$. This is done through the *Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff* equation for hydrostatic equilibrium

$$p' = -(p+\rho)\frac{m(r) + 4\pi r^3 p}{r(r-2m(r))}, \tag{18}$$

after the specification of $\rho(r)$. Imposing $\rho(r) = \rho_0/r^2$ and the constant of integration in equation (17) equal to zero, the ansatz $p = p_0/r^2$ gives a solution to equation (18) provided

$$p_0 = 2\pi \frac{(p_0 + \rho_0)^2}{(1 - 8\pi\rho_0)}. \tag{19}$$

A direct analysis of this equation shows that in order to have real solutions to (19) and satisfy $\rho_0 > 0$ and $h(r) > 0$, ρ_0 must range in $(0, 1/16\pi]$. For each value of ρ_0 in that range there are two positive solutions to equation (19), which are repeated when $\rho_0 = 1/16\pi$ in which case $p_0 = 1/16\pi$. The exponent ϕ is thus set from

$$\phi' = \frac{4\pi(\rho_0 + p_0)}{(1 - 8\pi\rho_0)r}.$$

The constant $4\pi(\rho_0 + p_0)/(1 - 8\pi\rho_0)$ can be seen to be equal to the square of the velocity v of circular orbits, which indeed is independent on the radius. The rotation curve is thus flat. With this interpretation we have

$$p_0 = \frac{1}{\frac{2}{v^2} - 1}\rho_0.$$

$$(2 - v^2)\frac{v^2}{2} = 4\pi \frac{\rho_0}{1 - 8\pi\rho_0}.$$

When $v \approx 0$, $m(r) \approx v^2 r$ which in non-geometrized unit is the widely used Newtonian expression

$$v = \sqrt{\frac{GM(r)}{r}},$$

where $M(r)$ is the total mass enclosed inside the radius r. In this regime of small rotational velocities, the discussion above reduces indeed to the so called *singular isothermal model* which is widely used in Galactic models. A complete discussion of this model and generalizations can be found in [16]. It is worth to mention that the *singular isothermal model* can be seen as Vlasov collision-less matter in thermal equilibrium [16].

Altogether we can write

$$\mathbf{g} = -r^{2v^2} dt^2 + \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2m(r)}{r}} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2. \tag{20}$$

and note that $1 - 2m(r)/r = 1 - 8\pi\rho_0$.

There are several important remarks that we would like to make about these solutions. They have to do with self-similarity, mass and isoperimetry. First observe that from the energy constraint we know that $R = 16\pi\rho$ therefore, and for the solutions above, the scale invariant product $r^2 R$ is constant and equal to $16\pi\rho_0$. Thus the scale down limit $\lim_{\lambda\rightarrow 0}\lambda^2 g$ is non-flat, which implies that the original solution cannot be asymptotically flat. Naturally, this conclusion can be reached by a direct inspection of the explicit solutions. A second observation is that the scale down limit of g is g itself, as g is self similar, namely there is a homothethic space-like killing field. These two observations form part indeed of general conclusions that can be obtained from a general notion, not necessarily static or spherically symmetric, of *isothermal asymptotic*. Such notion will be introduced and commented later. A second remark has to do with a characterization of mass in terms of an *area defect* or, too, in terms of an *isoperimetric defect*. A direct evaluation of the Hawking mass

$$m_{HW} = \sqrt{\frac{A}{16\pi}}(1 - \frac{1}{16\pi}\int_{S(r)} H^2 dA).$$

(above $S(r)$ is the sphere of constant radius r and H is its mean curvature) gives $m(r) = m_{HW}(r)$. To express it in terms of area, we use, instead of the coordinate radius r the metric radius

$$\bar{r} = \frac{r}{(1 - 2m(r)/r)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

This gives

$$m_{HW}(\bar{r}) = \sqrt{\frac{A(\bar{r})}{16\pi}\frac{(A_E(\bar{r}) - A(\bar{r}))}{A_E(\bar{r})}}.$$

Thus the scale invariant quotient $(\sqrt{16\pi}m(\bar{r}))/\sqrt{A(\bar{r})} = 8\pi\rho_0$ is equal to the *area defect*

$$8\pi\rho_0 = m(\bar{r})\sqrt{\frac{16\pi}{A(\bar{r})}} = \frac{A_E(\bar{r}) - A(\bar{r})}{A_E(\bar{r})},$$

where $A_E(\bar{r})$ is the area of the sphere of constant radius $\bar{r}$ in the Euclidean three-space. In the regime of small rotation velocities $v \approx 0$ we have thus in non-geometrized units

$$(\frac{v}{c})^2 \approx \frac{1}{2}\frac{A_E - A}{A_E},$$

For a galaxy with rotational velocity of the order of $300km/s$, it would imply an area defect of the order of 2.10^{-6}, a small effect. It is worth mentioning that G. Huisken[4] has developed a rigorous approach to mass as an isoperimetric defect which is related with the characterization of mass given above.

---

[4] Although it does not exist a written article in this respect, a tape recorded talk at the Institute of

The results described in Theorem 1 originated in the investigation of a general notion of *isothermal asymptotic*. It is experimentally well established (see [16] and references therein) that surrounding spiral galaxies there is, assuming the validity of General Relativity, a halo of energy whose density, within some radius, is consistent with the *isothermal*. The actual *extent* of the dark halos (an important question) is uncertain at present. In [5] for instance, it is claimed, using weak-lensing techniques, that a profile compatible with the isothermal extends (for L_* galaxies) up to at least $200h^{-1}kpc$. The problem of the actual, more accurate, shape of the density profile, as well as its actual decay law, lacks still a conclusive answer. It is pertinent thus to ask, even for the sake of theoretical purposes, for a general notion of *isothermal asymptotic*[5] and for its physical as well as geometrical and optical properties. More in particular it is pertinent to ask, within this theoretical framework, up to which extent and in which amount could the halo's energy be accounted for gravitation. Let us elaborate more in detail on the reasons supporting these questions.

There are various ways to define maximal states with *isothermal asymptotic*. The rough physical requirement is that the scalar curvature $R \geq 0$ decays (without making this more precise) as $1/r^2$. Under general hypothesis on the geometry of the states, this implies the existence of a scaled down limit state. Because of its mathematical convenience we will take this property as a definition.

Definition 2 *A (say C^∞) maximal vacuum state (g, K) ($tr_g K = k = 0$) over a three-manifold Σ is said to have isothermal asymptotic if there is a compact set $\mathcal{K}$ in Σ such that $\Sigma \sim \mathcal{K}$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3 - \{o\}$ and such that the limit*

$$\lim_{\lambda\rightarrow 0}(\lambda^2 g, \lambda K)$$

exists and is non-flat.

Recall that this means there is a family of diffeomorphisms φ_λ such that $\varphi^*_\lambda(\lambda^2 g, \lambda K)$ converges (say in C^∞) to a limit state (g_I, K_I) on $\mathbb{R}^3 - \{o\}$. The limit state is thus scale invariant, i.e. for any $\lambda > 0$ there is $\psi_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^3 - \{o\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 - \{o\}$ such that $(\lambda^2 g_I, \lambda K_I) = \psi^*_\lambda(g_I, K_I)$ and the correspondence $\lambda \rightarrow \psi_\lambda$ is a homomorphism. If we

---

Advanced Studies - Princeton can be found at http://video.ias.edu/taxonomy/term/18.

[5] We have been using the name *isothermal asymptotic* as a name borrowed from the low velocity limit and without further thermodynamical content.

further assume the correspondence is differentiable then the vector field defined by

$$Y(p) = \frac{d}{d\lambda}\psi_{\lambda}(p)|_{\lambda=1},$$

is a homothetic Killing field, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_Y(g_I, K_I) = (2g_I, K_I)$.

In the presence of matter in the form of a general perfect fluid with energy-momentum tensor $T = \rho u\otimes u + p(u\otimes u + \mathbf{g})$, we demand, for the state to be *isothermal*, that the limits, $\lim_{\lambda\rightarrow 0}\rho/\lambda^2$, $\lim_{\lambda\rightarrow 0} p/\lambda^2$ and $\lim_{\lambda\rightarrow 0}\lambda u$, exist.

It is easily seen that the existence of an asymptotic homothetic Killing field requires that, for the limit state, $|K|^2$, ρ and p decay as $1/r^2$. If from the energy constraint $R = |K|^2 + \frac{1}{16\pi}\rho$ we could interpret $|K|^2$ as an effective density of energy accounting from gravitation, then, if the fraction (in non-geometrized units) $16\pi c^2|K|^2/G\rho$ is significant at one point then it is equally significant, it is preserved indeed, at any other point along the outgoing orbit of the homothetic Killing field. If the solution in addition is stationary, such fraction is also preserved in time. If one accepts a notion of stationary isothermal asymptotic for galactic halos (at least on a large range of the galactic radius) then we believe that considering the extremely low value of the quantity $16\pi G\rho/c^2$ for actual galaxies, that it is a at least a theoretical worthwhile enterprise the study the influence of the gravitational effective term $|K|^2$.

Finalizing, we mention that it is indeed possible to construct isothermal axisymmetric vacuum states. At least at a given time, they share geometric properties with the solutions (20). The Hawking mass is positive and grows linearly with the radius. The positivity of the Hawking energy may be a general property and could be related to G. Huisken's approach to mass. The construction of these states will be published elsewhere.

Theorem 1 can be interpreted in this context as the fact that, granted General Relativity to be correct and granting a stationary regime of actual spirals, then the dark halo energy density cannot be accounted solely to gravitation.

It is worth finally to remark that if a non-stationary, vacuum isothermal state as mentioned before, has a density $16\pi c^2|K|^2/G$ of the order of typical spirals, then extrapolating linearly the deformation $|\dot{g}|^2 = 4N^2|K|^2$ (in the zero shift gauge) would imply a noticeable change in the metric g at about $100kpc$ in about $10^6 yrs$.

2 Background material.

2.1 Notation

Below we describe in detail most of the notation that will be used.

- (The distance function) - Let E be a three-dimensional manifold diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3$ minus a ball. Let g be a complete (as a metric space) Riemannian metric on E. Let p be a point in E. Then the distance function from p to ∂E will be denoted by $d(p)$; namely

  $$d(p) := dist_g(p, \partial E).$$

- (The congruence $\mathcal{F}$) - Outside a set of measure zero, the *locus* $\mathcal{C}$, the distance function d is smooth. Through every point in $E \setminus \mathcal{C}$ there passes one and only one length minimizing geodesic segment to ∂E. Thus $E \setminus \mathcal{C}$ is foliated by length minimizing geodesics segments, every one of which starts perpendicularly to ∂E, and is either of infinite length or ends at $\mathcal{C}$. Such congruence of geodesics will be denoted by $\mathcal{F}(\partial E)$ or simply $\mathcal{F}$. A geodesic segment in $\mathcal{F}$ of infinite length will be called a *ray*.

  Given $p \in E \setminus \mathcal{C}$, we will denote by γ_p the geodesic segment in $\mathcal{F}$ passing through p. The initial point of γ_p at E will be denoted by $e(p)$ and the final point, when γ is not a ray, will be denoted by $q(p)$. If γ_p is a ray, we will simply write and think that "$q(p) = \infty$". In this notation $q(e)$ will be always the "final point" of the only geodesic segment γ that starts at e. In consistence with this notation, given γ in $\mathcal{F}$ we will denote by e its *initial point* on ∂E and by q its *final point*.

- (The velocity field) - Given γ in $\mathcal{F}$ we will denote by s the arc-length from its initial point e. Observe that $d(p) = s(p)$ where s is the arc-length of γ_p. We will denote by n the *velocity field* on $E \setminus \mathcal{C}$, namely

  $$n(p) := \frac{d}{ds}\gamma_p(s)\Big|_{s=s(p)}.$$

- (The mean curvature) - Given $r > 0$, consider the *level surface* $S(p) = \{q \in E \setminus \mathcal{C}/d(q) = r\}$. We will denote the intrinsic metric by h and by Θ the second fundamental form with respect n. The mean curvature will be denoted by θ; namely $\theta := tr_h\Theta$. The traceless part of Θ will be denoted by $\hat{\Theta} := \Theta - (\theta/2)h$.

- (The element of area) - Let p be a point in $E \setminus C$. Then there is a neighborhood $\Omega_{e(p)}$ of $e(p)$ in ∂E, such that the map

$$e \in \Omega_p \to \gamma_e(d(p)), \tag{21}$$

is a diffemorphism into the image. Let dA be the differential of area of $S(p)$ (with the induced metric h) at p. Because of the diffeomorphism above, the quotient $dA(p)/dA(e(p))$ is well defined. Let γ be in $\mathcal{F}$. We have

$$\theta(\gamma(s)) = \frac{d}{ds}\ln\frac{dA(\gamma(s))}{dA(\gamma(0))},$$

or, shortly,

$$\theta = \frac{dA'}{dA}.$$

where $'$ denotes derivative with respect to arc-length.

- (Neighborhoods and boundaries) - Let $\Omega \subset \partial E$ be an open domain on ∂E. We define

$$U(\Omega, r) = \text{Closure}(\{p \in E \setminus C/d(p) \leq r \text{ and } e(p) \in \Omega\}), \tag{22}$$

$$\bar{\partial}U(\Omega, r) = \{p \in U(\Omega, r)/d(p) = r\}. \tag{23}$$

We also define

$$A(\bar{\partial}U(\Omega, r)) = \text{Area}(\bar{\partial}U(\Omega, r)), \tag{24}$$

$$V(U(\Omega, r)) = \text{Volume}(U(\Omega, r)), \tag{25}$$

and we have $dV(U(\Omega, r))/dr = A(U(\Omega, r))$ at almost every value of r.

- (Annuli) - Given a positive natural k and $r > 0$ we define the *annulus*

$$A_k(r) = \{p \in E/2^{-k}r < d(p) < 2^k r\}.$$

Occasionally we will use the notation

$$A(r_1, r_2) = \{p \in E / r_1 < d(p) < r_2\}.$$

Connected components of annulus will be denoted with a superscript c, i.e. $A^c_k(r)$ and $A^c(r_1, r_2)$.

- (Scaling) - Given $r > 0$ we will denote the scaled metric $r^{-2}g$ by g_r. Tensors and metric quantities constructed out of g_r will be written with a subindex r. For instance, $Ric_{g_r} = Ric_r$, or, $dist_{g_r}(p, \partial E) = d(p)/r = d_r(p)$. This notation will be used extensively all through the article.

- (Curves, loops and Lengths) - Given a curve α we will denote its g-length by $\ell(\alpha)$. *Loops* are curves which start and end at the same point and are *geodesic loops* if in addition are geodesic segments. We will use the notation $\mathcal{L}(p)$ for loops based at p (p is the initial point).

2.2 The Bishop-Gromov volume comparison.

In the Lemma below and for the sake of clarity we review the standard Bishop-Gromov volume comparison (which in standard form is for geodesic balls) to get the monotonic quotient (15) and further information. The proof will also serve to introduce the main formulas to be used later. The knowledgeable reader can skip it.

Lemma 1 *Let (E, g) be a (smooth) complete Riemannian three-manifold with boundary $\partial E \neq \emptyset$. Suppose that $Ric \geq 0$. Then*

1. *For any $p \in E \setminus C$ we have*

$$\theta(p) \leq \frac{2}{d(p)}. \tag{26}$$

2. *For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}$ we have*

$$\frac{dA(\gamma(s))}{dA(\gamma(0))}\frac{1}{s^2}\downarrow, \tag{27}$$

where here, as well as below, $\downarrow$ means (not necessarily strictly) decreasing in s.

3. *For any open domain $\Omega \subset \partial E$ we have*

$$\frac{A(\overline{\partial} U(\Omega, r))}{r^2} \Big\downarrow \mu(\Omega) \geq 0. \tag{28}$$

$$\frac{V(U(\Omega, r))}{r^3} \Big\downarrow \frac{\mu(\Omega)}{3} \geq 0. \tag{29}$$

as $r \to \infty$ and where $\mu(\Omega)$ is a non-negative number depending on Ω.

Proof:

Item 1 - We recall first the Riccati or Focusing equation. Given $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}$, we have, along it

$$\theta' = -|\Theta|^2 - Ric(n, n) = -\frac{\theta^2}{2} - |\hat{\Theta}|^2 - Ric(n, n). \tag{30}$$

where $'$ denotes derivative with respect to the arc-length. Thus, if $Ric \geq 0$ then θ is monotonically decreasing. Therefore we observe that if $\theta(s_0) \leq 0$ then $\theta(s) - 2/s \leq 0$ for any $s > s_0$. On the other hand suppose $\theta(s_0) > 0$, then dividing (30) by θ^2 and integrating in s from s_0 we get

$$-\frac{1}{\theta(s)} + \frac{s}{2} = -\frac{1}{\theta(s_0)} + \frac{s_0}{2} - \int_{s_0}^{s} \frac{|\hat{\Theta}|^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{Ric(n, n)}{\theta^2} ds. \tag{31}$$

Therefore if $\theta(s_0) > 0$ and $\theta(s_0) - 2/s_0 \leq 0$ then $\theta(s) - 2/s \leq 0$ until at least the first s_1 for which $\theta(s_1) = 0$. But from the first observation we have $\theta(s) - 2/s \leq 0$ for any $s \geq s_0$. Using this and $\lim_{s \to 0} \theta(s) - 2/s = -\infty$ we deduce that $\theta(s) - 2/s \leq 0$ for any s in the range of the arc-length of any geodesic γ in $\mathcal{F}$. The *item 1* follows.

Item 2 - For this we note that

$$(\ln \frac{dA(\gamma(s))}{dA(\gamma(0))} \frac{1}{s^2})' = \theta(s) - \frac{2}{s},$$

which is non-positive by *item1*.

Item 3 - We note first that

$$A(\overline{\partial} U(\Omega, r)) = \int_{\Omega_r} \frac{dA(\gamma_e(r))}{dA(e)} dA(e), \tag{32}$$

where we have followed the notation introduced in Section 2.1 for $dA(p)$ and $\gamma_p(s)$ and where Ω_r is the set

$$\Omega_r = \{e \in \Omega / \gamma_e(r) \in E \setminus C\}.$$

Observing that $\Omega_{r_1} \subset \Omega_r$ if $r_1 > r$ we can use (32) and *item 2* to get the first part of *item 3*. For the second part observe that $V(U(\Omega, r))' = A(\overline{\partial} U(\Omega, r))$ for almost every value of r and use the *items* before. □

2.3 Remarks on the Cheeger-Gromov theory of Riemannian convergence.

We recall first the notion of convergence of Riemannian manifolds. For a systematic presentation of these notions see for instance [12]. Let $\{(W_i, g_i)\}$ be a sequence of compact and connected smooth Riemannian manifolds possibly with boundary. Then, we say that $\{(W_i, g_i)\}$ converges in $C^{j,\alpha}$ ($j \geq 1$) to a compact and connected Riemannian $C^{j,\alpha}$-manifold (W_∞, g_∞) iff there are $C^{j+1,\alpha}$-diffeomorphisms $\varphi : W_\infty \to W_i$ such that $\|\varphi_i^* g_i - g_\infty\|_{C^{j,\alpha}} \to 0$.

For sequences of compact boundary less three-manifolds $\{(W_i, g_i)\}$ there exists the well known Theorem of convergence in $C^{1,\alpha}$ under the bounds $|Ric_{g_i}| \leq \Lambda_0$, $Vol_{g_i}(W_i) \geq V_0 > 0$ and $diam_{g_i}(W_i) \leq D_0$ (**Theorem 2.1** in [1] Pg. 208). There are similar statements also when the manifolds W_i have boundary. We give them below.

Lemma 2 (Convergence of Riemannian manifolds with boundary) *Let $\{(M_i, g_i)\}$ be a sequence of Riemannian three-manifolds possibly with boundary and let $\{W_i\}$, be a sequence of compact, connected (three)-submanifolds of $\{M_i\}$. Suppose that*

1. $\|Ric_{g_i}\|_{L^\infty(M_i)} \leq \Lambda_0$,
2. $Vol_{g_i}(W_i) \geq V_0 > 0$,
3. $diam^I(W_i) \leq D_0 < \infty$, *where $diam^I$ is the intrinsic diameter of (W_i, g_i) (and not the diameter as a set in (M_i, g_i)).*
4. $dist_{g_i}(W_i, \partial M_i) \geq C_0 > 0$.

Then, there is a sequence $\{\tilde{W}_i\}$ of compact and connected (three)-submanifolds of $\{M_i\}$, containing W_i for each i and having a subsequence, converging in $C^{1,\alpha}$ to a limit manifold $(\tilde{W}_\infty, g_\infty)$.

Remark 2 *We remark that our statement differs slightly from* **Lemma 1.3** *in Pg. 982 of [2] (see also the same statement in Remark 2.2, Pg. 208. [1]). Such statement, as written, is inaccurate (counterexamples having complicated boundaries can be given; see the Appendix), moreover we have found no written proof of it in the literature. This more or less technical remark has to be taken into account in our case, as we have a* *priori rather scarce control of the boundary of the annuli $A_k(r)$ where we are mainly interested in applying the Lemma. Note that the main (and only) difference between Lemma 2 and* **Lemma 1.3** *in [2] is that we do not assume the volume and diameter bounds to be on (M_i, g_i) but rather on (W_i, g_i).*

Because of these Remarks we include an appendix where we discuss these delicacies and provide the elements of the proof of 2.

2.4 Elliptic estimates for stationary solutions.

The stationary solutions $(g, \omega, \ln u)$ satisfy important regularity properties derived directly from the elliptic system (9)-(12) (see [2]). In particular the following straightforward Proposition says, essentially, that an upper bound on R on a geodesic ball $B(p, r)$ (not touching the boundary), the value of u at p and a lower bound on $inj(p)$, control the solution in C^Γ inside $B(p, r/2)$ for any $\Gamma \geq 0$. This basic fact will be assumed more or less automatically all along the article without further notices.

Proposition 1 *Let $(g, \omega, \ln u)$ be a solution of $(9) - (12)$ on a three-manifold M. Let $p \in M$ and suppose that $B(p, r) \subset M$. Suppose that $\sup\{R(q), q \in B(p, r)\} \leq R_0$, $inj(p) \geq I_0 > 0$ and $u(p) + 1/u(p) \leq \Lambda_0$. Then for any $\Gamma \geq 0$ there is $c_\Gamma(R_0, I_0, \Lambda_0) > 0$ such that the $C^\Gamma_g(B(p, r/2))$ norm of Ric, ω and $\ln u$ is bounded by c_Γ. In particular, the metric g is controlled in C^Γ over $B(p, r/2)$ for any $\Gamma > 0$.*

It is important to remark that ω and u can be scaled (as $(u(p)^{-2}\omega, u(p)^{-1}u) = (\bar{\omega}, \bar{u})$, and without scaling g, to have at any point p, $\bar{u}(p) = 1$. Thus, in a sense, the value of u at a point is not an obstacle for the existence of elliptic estimates for g (and after scaling ω and u too).

2.5 Anderson's a priori curvature decay.

We recall below Anderson's curvature decay given in [2].

Proposition 2 ([2]) *There exists a universal $c > 0$ such that for any regular end $(E, (g, w, \ln u))$ we have*

$$R \leq \frac{c}{d^2}. \tag{33}$$

In particular

$$|Ric| + 2|\nabla \ln u|^2 + 2\frac{|\omega|^2}{u^4} \leq 2R \leq \frac{2c}{d^2}. \tag{34}$$

A technical note is in order. **Theorem 0.2** in [2], where curvature decay is stated, applies to the quotient metric $\tilde{g}$. However, a simple inspection of [2] shows that the same statement applies to the metric g as well.

Decay of the derivatives of R can be established by the same procedure as in [2]. We have

$$|\nabla^{\Gamma} R| \leq \frac{c_{\Gamma}}{d^{2+\Gamma}}. \tag{35}$$

We will not use this decay explicitly but instead (33) and the elliptic estimates of the Section 2.4.

2.6 Definition and structure of limit annuli.

Let us see how to apply Lemma 2 to define *limit annulus*. This will be our main application of Lemma 2. Let $(E, (g, \omega, \ln u))$ be a regular end. The "ball covering property" [11] (use in particular *Remark 2* with $S = \bar{A}_k(r)$ in [11]) ($\bar{A}_k(r)$ is the closure of $A_k(r)$) implies that, for r_0 sufficiently large, there is a natural $N(r_0, c, k) > 0$ such that for any $r \geq r_0$ there is a set of points $\{p_i, i = 1, \ldots n \leq N\}$ in $\bar{A}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r)$ such that

$$\bar{A}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r) \subset \cup_{i=1}^{i=n} B(p_i, \frac{1}{8} 2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}} r) \subset A_{k+1}(r)$$

where the second inequality is a consequence of the triangle inequality (it is worth noting that "the ball covering property" is a fundamental fact allowing a vast part of the technical analysis in this paper). Let $W(r)$ denote maximal connected unions of balls. Obviously the number of such $W(r)$'s is uniformly bounded independently on r. In order to apply Lemma 2, we will think that $W(r) \subset M(r) := \bar{A}_{k+1}(r)$ with the Riemannian metric g_r. We have

1. $\|Ric\|_{L^{\infty}_{g_r}(A_{k+1})} \leq c(k)$, (Anderson's a priori decay, Section 2.5),
2. $Vol_{g_r}(W(r)) \geq Vol_{g_r}(A_k(r) \cap W(r))$,
3. $diam^{I}_{g_r}(W(r)) \leq n\frac{1}{8}2^{-k}$,
4. $dist_{g_r}(W(r)), \partial A_{k+1}(r)) \geq \frac{2^{-k-1}}{3} > 0$.

Thus if for some divergent sequence $\{r_i\}$, there is a sequence $\{W(r_i)\}$ (of $W(r_i)$'s) such that $Vol_{g_r}(A_k(r_i) \cap W(r_i)) \geq \underline{\mu} > 0$ then we are in the hypothesis of Lemma 2. We conclude in this case that there are manifolds $\tilde{W}(r_i)$ containing $W(r_i)$ and contained in $A_{k+1}(r_i)$ having a subsequence (indexed also by "i") converging in $C^{1,\alpha}$ to a limit manifold $\tilde{W}(\infty)$. By the elliptic estimates of Section 2.4 we know that we can scale u and ω if necessary to have a limit C^∞ stationary solution. We will denote such solution by $(g_\infty, u_\infty, \omega_\infty)$.

The distance functions d_{r_i} are 1-Lipschitz and uniformly bounded on $A_{k+1}(r_i)$. Moreover as $|\nabla d_{r_i}| = 1$ a.e. then $\|d_{r_i}\|_{H^1_{g_{r_i}}}$ is uniformly bounded. We deduce that there is a subsequence of $\{d_i\}$ converging strongly in C^0 and weakly in H^1 to a 1-Liptschitz and H^1 limit distance function d_∞ on $\tilde{W}(\infty)$. The set $A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty) := \{p \in \tilde{W}(\infty)/2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}} < d_\infty < 2^{k+\frac{1}{2}}\}$ is the $(k+\frac{1}{2})$-*limit annulus of* $\tilde{\Omega}_\infty$. Note that because $dist(A_k(r_i), \partial A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r_i)) \geq C_1(k) > 0$ and $Vol_{g_r}(A_k(r_i) \cap W(r_i)) \geq \underline{\mu} > 0$ then the $(k+\frac{1}{2})$-limit annulus is non-empty. Note too that the values of d_∞ at the boundary of any $A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty)$ are either $2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}}$ or $2^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$.

We pass now to describe the structure of limit annuli $(A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty), g_\infty)$.

For every $k \geq 1$ define $A^-_k(r)$ to be the set of points in $A_k(r)$ such that the geodesic segments in $\mathcal{F}$ passing through them have g_r-length at most 2^k. Let $\Omega^-_k(r)$ be the set of all the initial points of the geodesic segments in $\mathcal{F}$ intersecting $A^-_k(r)$.

Proposition 3 *Let* $(E, (g, \omega, \ln u))$ *be a regular end. Then*

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} V_r(A^-_k(r)) = 0.$$

Proof:

Because of the monotonicity of $V(U(\Omega, r))/r^3$ for arbitrary sets Ω, we know that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is $r(\epsilon)$ such that for any $r \geq r(\epsilon)$ and $2^{-k-1} \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq 2^{k+1}$ we have

$$\left| \frac{V_r(U(\Omega^-_k(r), \tau_1 r))}{\tau_1^3} - \frac{V_r(U(\Omega^-_k(r), \tau_2 r))}{\tau_2^3} \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

Note that if $2^k = \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq 2^{k+1}$ then

$$V_r(A^-_k(r)) \leq V_r(U(\Omega^-_k(r), \tau_1 r)) = V_r(U(\Omega^-_k(r), \tau_2 r)),$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that the geodesic segments belonging to $U(\Omega^-_k(r), \tau_2 r)$ do not extend in g_r-length further than 2^k. Combining the two previous equations for the choice $\tau_1 = 2^k$, $\tau_2 = 2^{k+1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon &\geq \left|\frac{V_r(U(\Omega_k^-(r), \tau_1 r))}{\tau_1^3} - \frac{V_r(U(\Omega_k^-(r), \tau_2 r))}{\tau_2^3}\right| \\ &\geq \frac{7}{82^{3k}} V_r(U(\Omega_k^-(r), \tau_2 r)) \geq \frac{7}{82^{3k}} V_r(A_k^-(r))\end{aligned}$$

which proves the result. □

We show now that θ_r converges in L^1 to $2/d_\infty$.

Proposition 4 *Let* $(E, (g, \omega, \ln u))$ *be a regular end. Then*

$$\int_{A_k(r)} \frac{2}{d_r} - \theta_r \, dV_r \to 0, \text{ as } r \to \infty. \tag{36}$$

Therefore θ_r *is uniformly bounded in* $L^1_{g_r}(A_k(r))$*.*

Proof:

We show first the uniform bound of θ_r in $L^1_{g_r}$ assuming (36). We note that because of $\theta_r \leq 2/d_r$ we have

$$\int_{A_k(r)} \theta_r^+ \, dV_r \leq \int_{A_k(r)} \frac{2}{d_r} \, dV_r,$$

where $\theta_r^+ := \sup\{0, \theta_r\}$. To get a uniform upper bound on the right hand side observe that on $A_k(r)$, $1/d_r \leq 2^{-k}$, and that the g_r-volume of $A_k(r)$ is uniformly bounded above. From (36) we obtain for r sufficiently big

$$\int_{A_k(r)} \theta_r^- \, dV_r \leq -\int_{A_k(r)} \frac{2}{d_r} \, dV_r + \int_{A_k(r)} \theta_r^+ \, dV_r + 1,$$

where $\theta_r^- := \sup\{0, -\theta_r\}$. The bound in $L^1_{g_r}$ follows.

We show now (36) which completes the proof of the proposition.

Recall that, fixed $\tau \in [2^{-k}, 2^k]$ we have

$$\frac{A_r(\overline{\partial} U(\partial E, \tau r))}{\tau^2} \downarrow_r \mu(\partial E). \tag{37}$$

Thus we have

$$0 \leq \frac{A_r(\overline{\partial} U(\partial E, \tau_1 r))}{\tau_1^2} - \frac{A_r(\overline{\partial} U(\partial E, \tau_2 r))}{\tau_2^2} \to_r 0, \tag{38}$$

for any fixed $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$ in $[2^{-k}, 2^k]$. We are going to observe now an important *Fact* (we will name it this way). For that, we consider the set of geodesics segments in $\mathcal{F}$ that extend at least a g_r-distance 2^k and let $\Omega_k^+(r)$ be the set of its initial points in ∂E, then (from the monotonicity) we observe the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A_r(\overline{\partial}U(\partial E, 2^k r))}{2^k} &= \frac{A_r(\overline{\partial}U(\Omega_k^+(r), 2^k r))}{2^k} \\ &\leq \frac{A_r(\overline{\partial}U(\Omega_k^+(r), \tau r))}{\tau^2} \leq \frac{A_r(\overline{\partial}U(\partial E, \tau r))}{\tau^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

It follows from this and (38) that: *Fact* - the g_r-area (A_r) of the set of points at a g_r-distance τ from ∂E whose geodesic segment in $\mathcal{F}$ does not extend to have a g_r-length at least 2^k, tends to zero as $r \to \infty$.

We will be concerned now with the sets $\overline{\partial}U(\Omega_k^+(r), \tau r)$, $\tau \in [2^{-k}, 2^k]$. Along a geodesic segment $\gamma(\tau)$ with g_r-arc length $s_r(\tau) = \tau$ in $U(\Omega_k^+(r), 2^k r))$ we have

$$\frac{dA_r(\tau)}{s_r^2(\tau)} = e^{\int_{s_r(2^{-k})}^{s_r(\tau)} \theta_r(\overline{\tau}) - \frac{2}{s_r(\overline{\tau})}\, d\overline{\tau}}\, \frac{dA_r(2^{-k})}{s_r^2(2^{-k})}, \tag{40}$$

Of course we could have used the replacements $s_r(\tau) = \tau$ and $s_r(2^{-k}) = 2^{-k}$, but the geometric meaning is more evident in this way. Now, a direct integration by parts using

$$\frac{d}{ds_r(\tau)}\ \ln dA_r(\tau) - \ln s_r^2(\tau) = \theta_r(\tau) - \frac{2}{s_r(\tau)},$$

(which is the differential version of the equation (40)) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{U(\Omega_k^+(r),2^k)\cap A_k(r)} \frac{2}{d_r} - \theta_r dV_r &= -\int dA_r(\tau)\Big|_{\tau=2^{-k}}^{\tau=2^k} + 2\int \frac{1}{s_r(\tau)} dA_r ds_r(\tau) \\ = A_r(\overline{\partial}U(\Omega_k^+(r), 2^{-k})) - A_r(\overline{\partial}U(\Omega^+, 2^k r)) &+ 2\int_{s_r(2^{-k})}^{s_r(2^k)} \frac{A_r(\overline{\partial}U(\Omega_k^+(r), \tau r))}{s_r(\tau)} ds_r(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

Using (37), (38) and (39), we obtain that the right hand side tends to zero and therefore the left hand side. To finish the proof of (36) it remains to show that the integral of $2/s_r - \theta_r$ over $A_k \setminus U(\Omega_k^+(r), 2^k r)$ also tends to zero. But this follows easily again by an integration by parts and the use of the *Fact* above and (39). □

We prove now that distance functions d_∞ are smooth on any limit annulus $A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r_i)$.

Proposition 5 (Smoothness of d_∞) *Let $(E,(g,\omega,\ln u))$ be a regular end. Let $(A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty), g_\infty)$ be a limit annulus and let d_∞ be the limit distance function. Then, d_∞ is smooth.*

Proof:

Let $\{d_{r_i}\}$ be the sequence of distance functions on $\tilde{W}(r_i)$ converging strongly in C^0 and weakly in H^1 to d_∞ over $\tilde{W}(\infty)$. We show now that, in addition, d_{r_i} converges to a weak solution of

$$\Delta_{g_\infty} d_\infty = \frac{2}{d_\infty}.$$

For this purpose consider f a C^1 function in $A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty)$ of compact support. We will show that for any such f we have

$$-\int_{A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty)} < \nabla f, \nabla d_\infty >_{g_\infty} \, dV_\infty = \int_{A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty)} \frac{2f}{d_\infty} dV_\infty. \tag{41}$$

It then follows from elliptic regularity ([8], Theorem 8.8 in pg. 183, after Definition in pg. 177) that d_∞ is smooth. We prove now (41). Consider the congruence $\mathcal{F}$ over $A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r_i)$. We have

$$\int_{A_k(r_i)} < \nabla f_i, \nabla d_{r_i} >_{g_{r_i}} \, dV_{r_i} = \int \frac{d f_i}{d s_{r_i}} dA_{r_i} ds_{r_i}.$$

where df_i/ds_{r_i} is the derivative of f_i along the geodesics of the congruence $\mathcal{F}$ and with respect to arc-length s_{r_i}. Integrating by parts we get

$$\int_{A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r_i)} < \nabla f_i, \nabla d_{r_i} >_{g_{r_i}} \, dV_{r_i} = \int f_i(s^+_{r_i}) \, dA_{r_i}(s^+_{r_i}) - \int_{A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r_i)} f_i \theta_{r_i} \, dV_{r_i}. \tag{42}$$

where the $s^+_{r_i}$ in the expression $f_i(s_{r_i}) dA_{r_i}(s^+_{r_i})$ is the last (arc-length value) of the geodesics in $\mathcal{F}$ inside $A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r_i)$. Note that because f_i has compact support in the interior of $A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r_i)$, if $s^+_{r_i} = 2^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ (the maximum possible value) then $f_i(s^+_{r_i}) = 0$. For the same reason the lower limit of integration in (42) was omitted (it is always zero). From monotonicity we know that

$$dA_{r_i}(s^+_{r_i}) \leq (\frac{s^+_{r_i}}{2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}}})^2 dA_{r_i}(2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Thus, from this we obtain that the first integrand in the right hand side of (42) is less or equal than then supremum of f_i (uniformly bounded) times $(s^+_{r_i}/2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}})^2 \leq 2^{4k+2}$

times the area of the set of points, at a g_{r_i}-distance $2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}}$ from ∂E whose geodesic segment in $\mathcal{F}$ does not extends to a g_{r_i}-arc length greater than $2^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$. Such area we know tends to zero (*Fact* inside Proposition 4 (with $k+\frac{1}{2}$ instead of k)). Combining this with Proposition 4 we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}-\int_{A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty)} < \nabla f, \nabla d_\infty >_{g_\infty} dV_\infty &= -\lim \int_{A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r_i)} < \nabla f_i, \nabla d_{r_i} >_{g_{r_i}} dV_{r_i} \\ &= \lim \int_{A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(r_i)} f_i \theta_{r_i} dV_{r_i} = \int_{A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty)} \frac{2f}{d_\infty} dV_\infty .\end{aligned}$$

□

We discuss now the structure of limit annuli.

Proposition 6 (The geometric structure of $(A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty), g_\infty)$) *Let* $(A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty), g_\infty)$ *be a (connected component of a) limit annulus of a regular end* $(E, (g, \omega, \ln u))$. *Then, for every* $\tau \in (2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}}, 2^{k+\frac{1}{2}})$ *the level set* $d_\infty^{-1}(\tau)$ *is a two-sphere* $S(\tau)$ *of area* $\mu(\partial E)\tau^2$. *Moreover we have*

$$\Theta_\infty = \frac{1}{\tau} h(\tau),\ \theta_\infty = \frac{2}{\tau},$$
$$Ric_\infty(n_\infty, n_\infty) = 0,$$

where $h(\tau)$, Θ_∞ *and* θ_∞ *are the induced metric, the second fundamental form and the mean curvature (in the direction of* $n_\infty = \nabla d_\infty$*) over* $S(\tau)$.

Proof:

First observe that every $\tau \in (2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}}, 2^{k+\frac{1}{2}})$ is a regular value of d_∞ (for $|\nabla d_\infty|_{g_\infty} = 1$). With this and noting that the values of d_∞ over the boundary of $A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty)$ are $2^{-k-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $2^{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ we obtain that $d_\infty^{-1}(\tau)$ is a compact manifold that we will denote by S_τ. As $\Delta_{g_\infty} d_\infty = 2/d_\infty$ we conclude that the mean curvature over $S(\tau)$ is equal to $2/\tau$. From

$$\dot{\theta_\infty} = -|\hat{\Theta}_\infty|^2 - \frac{\theta_\infty^2}{2} - Ric_\infty(n_\infty, n_\infty),$$

we conclude that $\hat{\Theta}_\infty = 0$ and $Ric(n_\infty, n_\infty) = 0$. Finally from

$$2\kappa + |\Theta_\infty|^2 - \theta_\infty^2 = R_\infty - 2Ric_\infty(n_\infty, n_\infty),$$

we deduce that κ, the Gaussian curvature, is positive and thus $S(\tau)$ must be a sphere.□

Corollary 1 (Limit annulus are standard flat annulus) *Let* $(A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty), g_\infty)$ *be a (connected component of a) limit annulus of a regular end* $(E,(g,\omega,\ln u))$*. Then* $\mu(\partial E) = 4\pi$ *and* $\kappa = 1/\tau^2$*, where* κ *is the Gaussian curvature of* $S(\tau)$*. Therefore the limit annulus* $(A_{k+\frac{1}{2}}(\infty), g_\infty)$ *is a whole standard annulus in Euclidean three-space.*

Proof:

Observe first that by the previous Proposition we get the representation

$$g_\infty = d\tau^2 + \tau^2 h(1),$$

On the other hand from $Ric_\infty(n_\infty, n_\infty) = 0$ and (9) (for the limit stationary solution) we deduce that $n_\infty(\ln u_\infty) = 0$. From these two facts we deduce that, calculated over $S(\tau)$ we have the identity

$$\Delta \ln u_\infty = \Delta_{h(\tau)} \ln u_\infty,$$

where $\Delta_{h(\tau)} \ln_{u_\infty}$ is the Laplacian of $\ln u_\infty$ as a function over $S(\tau)$. Therefore from (10) we get

$$\Delta_{h(\tau)} \ln u_\infty = -\frac{2}{u_\infty^4}|\omega_\infty|^2.$$

Integrating over $S(\tau)$ we get $\omega_\infty = 0$ over every $S(\tau)$ and therefore over the whole annulus. We also get u_∞ constant over every $S(\tau)$, but because $n_\infty(\ln u_\infty) = 0$ we conclude that u_∞ must be constant over the whole annulus. From (9) we deduce that $Ric_\infty = 0$ and easily that $\kappa = 1/\tau^2$. Thus $\mu(\partial E) = Area_{h(1)}(S(1)) = 4\pi$. □

3 Proof of the main result.

In this section which is divided in two subsections we prove Theorem 1. In the first (sub)section we prove cubic volume growth and weak asymptotic flatness. On the second (sub)section we show the desired strong asymptotic flatness which finishes Theorem 1.

3.1 Cubic volume growth and weak asymptotic flatness.

Theorem 2 (Weak asymptotic flatness) *For any* $\delta > 0$ *and* $\Gamma \geq 1$*, there is* $r_0(\delta, \Gamma)$ *such that for any* $r \geq r_0$ *the annulus* $(A_2(r), g_r)$ *has only one connected component and* *the metric g_r is δ-close in C^Γ to a flat standard annulus. Therefore we have*

$$|Ric| + 2|\nabla \ln u|^2 + 2\frac{|\omega|^2}{u^4} \leq 2R \leq \frac{o(d)}{d^2}, \tag{43}$$

where $o(d) \to 0$ as $d \to \infty$.

The proof of this Theorem will be divided into several parts. Propositions 7 and 8 are preliminary results to Lemma 4 which is the main previous result before the proof of Theorem 2.

Proposition 7 *Let E be a manifold diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$ and let g be a complete Riemannian metric on E. Then, for any $k \geq 1$ and $r > 0$ there is only one connected component of $A_k(r)$ inside the only unbounded connected component of $E \setminus U(\partial E, 2^{-k}r)$.*

Proof:

Several proofs can be given to this basic fact. For instance **Lemma 6.1** in [10] proves (indeed proves more) this Proposition but for annuli defined with respect to a point and not with respect to ∂E. The proof can however be adapted easily to this case.

Another proof can be obtained from the following lines. Suppose to simplify that $\overline{\partial} U(\partial E, r) = S_1 \cup \ldots \cup S_n$, where every S_j is connected and smooth (if this is not satisfied one can smooth out the distance function and work with pre-images of regular values around r). If the statement of the Proposition is false then at least two of the S_j's, say S_{j_1} and S_{j_2}, lie in different connected components of $A_k(r)$ and lie too inside the only unbounded connected component of $E \setminus U(\partial E, 2^{-k}r)$. We claim that in this case there is a smooth closed curve whose signed intersection number to each one of them is equal to one. As E is topological $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$ and any closed curve is contractible, the intersection numbers must be zero, which is a contradiction. We show now the existence of such curve. Let S^2 be a sphere separating E into two connected components and whose distance to ∂E is greater than $2r$. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be two geodesic segments inside $U(\partial E, r)$ connecting ∂E to S_{j_1} and S_{j_2} respectively. Let p_1 and p_2 be the final points of γ_1 and γ_2 in S_{j_1} and S_{j_2} respectively. Because S_{j_1} and S_{j_2} connect to infinity (inside $U(\partial E, r)^c$) there exist curves α_1 and α_2 inside $U(\partial E, r)^c$ starting at p_1 and p_2 respectively and reaching S^2. The desired construction of the smooth closed curve is now direct. □

We state now a result from the Cheeger-Gromov-Fukaya theory of collapse of Riemannian three-manifolds which is of central importance. The Lemma is essentially (implied by) **Lemma 1.4** in [2] (Pg. 982) but we preferred a statement adapted to the needs of the present article. In particular the fact that E is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$ is not relevant, and the condition $Ric \geq 0$ can be replaced by some intrinsic diameter bound (as in (1.11) in **Lemma 1.4** in [2]). The proof we give is essentially a repetition of the arguments in [2] (Pg. 983). However we provide some technical clarifications and precise citations which were not included in [2].

Lemma 3 *Let* (E, g) *be a complete Riemannian manifold where E is homeomorphic to* $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$. *Let* $k \geq 1$. *Suppose that the following is satisfied*

1. (At most quadratic curvature decay) *There is* $c > 0$ *such that for all* p *in* E *we have*
$$|Ric(p)| \leq \frac{c}{d^2(p)}.$$
2. (Less than cubic volume growth)
$$\limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{V(U(\partial E, r))}{r^3} = 0.$$
3. (Non-negative Ricci) $Ric \geq 0$,

Then, given $\epsilon > 0$ *and* $\delta > 0$, *there exists* r_0 *and* $\epsilon_0 \leq \epsilon$ *such that for any* $r \geq r_0$ *there are a set of connected manifolds* $\{U_j(r),\ j = 0, \ldots, m(r) \leq \infty\}$, *with*

$$\overline{A}_k(r) \subset \cup_{j=0}^{j=m(r)} U_j \subset A_{k+1}(r),$$

$m(r) \leq m(c, r_0, k) < \infty$ *and each* $U_j(r)$ *intersecting* $A_k(r)$ *such that*

1. *each* $U_j(r)$ *is a manifold with at least one boundary component and where at every point* p *there is at least one geodesic loop* $\mathcal{L}(p)$ *with* $\ell_r(\mathcal{L}(p)) \leq \epsilon_0$, *and*
2. *if at a point* p *with* $d(p) = r \geq r_0$ *in* $U_j(r)$, *there are two non-homotopic (and relatively prime*[6]*) geodesic loops* $\mathcal{L}^1(p)$ *and* $\mathcal{L}^2(p)$ *with* $\ell_r(\mathcal{L}^1(p)) \leq \epsilon_0$, $\ell_r(\mathcal{L}^2(p)) \leq \epsilon_0$, *then there is a finite covering* $(\tilde{U}_j(r), \tilde{g}_r)$ *where* $\tilde{g}_r$ *is the lifted metric,* δ*-close in* $C^{1,\beta}$ *to a* T^2*-symmetric metric on* $I \times T^2$ *where* I *is an interval.*

Proof:

---

[6] Namely, one is not homotopic to a cover of the other.

Recall, the ball covering property [11] (again use in particular *Remark 2* with $S = \bar{A}_k(r)$ in [11]) implies that, for r_0 sufficiently large, there is a natural $N(r_0, c, k) > 0$ such that for any $r \geq r_0$ there is a set of points $\{p_i, i = 1, \ldots n \leq N\}$ in $\bar{A}_k(r)$ of such that

$$\bar{A}_k(r) \subset \cup_{i=1}^{i=n} B(p_i, \frac{1}{8}2^{-k}r) \subset A_{k+1}(r)$$

Note that from the triangle inequality one also deduces

$$\cup_{i=1}^{i=n} B(p_i, \frac{1}{4}2^{-k}r) \subset A_{k+1}(r).$$

We recall now a central *Fact* (we name it this way) concerning the balls $B(p_i, \frac{1}{8}2^{-k}r)$. The Fact is a direct consequence of the Cheeger-Gromov-Fukaya theory of collapse under curvature and diameter bounds. For convenience we state it in a more general setting.

Fact - Suppose we have a sequence of pointed Riemannian three-manifolds (possibly with boundary) $\{(M_i, g_i, p_i)\}$ such that

1. $B(p_i, \gamma) \subset B(p_i, 2\gamma) \subset M_i$, where $\gamma > 0$ is fixed and $\bar{B}(p_i, 2\gamma)$ is a compact set in the interior of M_i,
2. $Vol_{g_i}(B(p_i, 2\gamma)) \to 0$,
3. $\|Ric\|_{L^\infty(B(p_i,2\gamma))} \leq \Lambda_0 < \infty$, for some fixed Λ_0.

Then there is a subsequence (we index it again by "*i*") such that

1. the Riemannian manifolds $(B(p_i, \gamma), g_i)$ collapse along a sequence of pure and polarized $\mathcal{F}$-structures (Corollary 9-3 (and its proof) in Pg. 353 of [7]),
2. the Riemannian manifolds $(B(p_i, \gamma), g_i)$ converge in the Gromov Hausdorff topology to a metric space of (Hausdorff) dimension 1 or 2 (Theorem 9-1 (equation (9-2-1)) Pg. 353 of [7], or, **Theorem 0.6** Pg. 2 of [6]).

In both cases the balls are Seifert manifolds ([13] § 3) and the dimensions of the fibers are one (S^1) or two (T^2) depending whether the limit metric space has dimension two or one respectively.

Define now the manifolds $U_j(r)$ as maximal connected unions of balls $B(p_i, \frac{1}{8}2^{-k}r)$'s. We prove the Lemma with this definition of the manifolds $U_j(r)$'s (note that r_0 does not depend on any δ). One notes first that $m(r) \leq N := m(c, r_0, k)$ and that *item1* is direct. It remains *item 2*. But this easily follows by contradiction. Indeed (sketchily) suppose $\{(U_{j_i}(r_i), q_i)\}$ is a pointed sequence such that $d_{r_i}(q_i) = 1$ and that there is a sequence of relatively prime geodesic loops based at q_i such that $l_{r_i}(\mathcal{L}^1(q_i))$ and $l_{r_i}(\mathcal{L}^2(q_i))$ tend to zero but that one cannot unwrap $U_{j_i}(r_i)$ to obtain convergence in $C^{1,\beta}$ into a limit T^2-symmetric space. Then proceed as follows. First recall that every $U_{j_i}(r_i)$ is a finite (a uniformly bounded number) union of balls $B_{g_{r_i}}(p_{m_i}, \frac{1}{8}2^{-k})$. Then apply the *Fact* above to the balls $B_{g_{r_i}}(p_{m_i}, \frac{1}{8}2^{-k})$, endowed with the metrics g_{r_i}, (note they satisfy the hypothesis of the *Fact*) and use that if for given two sequences of balls $\{B_{g_{r_i}}(p_{m_i})\}$, $\{B_{g_{r_i}}(p_{m'_i})\}$, with $B(p_i) \cap B(p_j) \neq \emptyset$ (we omitted writing the radius), one of the sequences collapses into a one dimensional space, then so must do the other. Deduce from this that the whole manifolds $U_{j_i}(r_i)$ are collapsing into a one dimensional space with fibers T^2. As in this case the π_1 of the fibers inject into the π_1 of $U_{j_i}(r_i)$, one can then take coverings $\tilde{U}_{j_i}$ in such a way that (a subsequence of) $\{\tilde{U}_{j_i}, g_{r_i})\}$ converges in $C^{1,\beta}$ into a T^2-symmetric manifold.That gives a contradiction. □

Observe that *item 2* in Lemma 3 implies obviously the following:

Lemma 3 (item 2) - Restatement 1 *Given $k \geq 1$, if there is a divergent sequence $\{r_i\}$ such that for a sequence of points $\{p_i\}$, $p_i \in U_j(r_i)$ ($U_j(r_i)$ as in Lemma 3) with $d(p_i) = r_i$ there are two non-homotopic and relatively prime geodesic loops $\mathcal{L}_i^1(p_i)$ and $\mathcal{L}_i^2(p_i)$ whose g_{r_i}-length goes to zero as i goes to infinity, then there are finite coverings $(\tilde{U}_j(r_i), \tilde{g}_{r_i})$ where $\tilde{g}_{r_i}$ is the lifted metric, converging (strongly) in $C^{1,\beta}$ to a T^2-symmetric metric $\tilde{g}_\infty$ on $I \times T^2$ where I is an interval.*

Remark 3 *As a matter of fact, the coverings can be taken such that if $\{x\} \times T^2 \subset I \times T^2$ is the torus containing $\lim p_i$, then, on it, the relative metric inherited from $\tilde{g}_\infty$ is metrically the product $S^1 \times S^1$ (S^1 with the standard metric).*

Notation 1 *The following notation and terminology will be in use.*

- (The pieces $U_j(r)$) *We will keep the notation $U_j(r)$ for the Seifert manifolds covering $A_k(r)$ used in Lemma 3.*
- (The piece $U_0(r)$) *We will assume that $U_{j=0}(r)$ is the only piece covering, according to Lemma 7, the only connected component of $A_k(r)$ inside the only unbounded connected component of $E \setminus U(\partial E, 2^{-k}r)$.*
- (Sequences of type T) *A sequence $\{(U_{j_i}(r_i), g_{r_i})\}$ as in the restatement of item 2 of Lemma 3 will be called a sequence of type T.*

In the following we start to analyze the implications of assuming non-cubic volume growth, namely assuming that $\mu(\partial E) = 0$. We note first a direct application of Lemma 3.

Corollary 2 (to Lemma 3) *Assume the hypothesis of Lemma 3. If a sequence* $\{(U_{j_i}(r_i), g_{r_i})\}$ *is not of type* T *then for* i *sufficiently big the manifold* $U_{j_i}(r_i)$ *is a Seifert manifold ([13]) where the small geodesics loops (see item 1 in Lemma 3) describe the* S^1 *fibers of the Seifert structure.*

Let $(E, (g, \omega, \ln u))$ be a regular end. Then we know $Ric \geq 0$ and from Anderson's curvature decay estimates that $|Ric| \leq c/d^2$. Thus *hypothesis's item 1,3* in Lemma 3 are satisfied and if we assume $\mu(\partial E) = 0$ then so is *item2*. Then the three *items* in the hypothesis of Lemma 3 are satisfied and therefore the set of manifolds $\{U_j(r),\ j = 0, \ldots, m(r)\}$ are well defined.

We prove below a Proposition characterizing the nature of sequences of type T on stationary regular ends.

Proposition 8 *Let* $(E, (g, \omega, \ln u))$ *be a regular end. Suppose that*

$$\frac{V(U(\partial E, r))}{r^3}\Big\downarrow_{r\to\infty} \frac{\mu(\partial E)}{3} = 0.$$

Then the unwrapping $\{(\tilde{U}_j(r_i), \tilde{g}_{r_i})\}$ *of a sequence* $\{(U_j(r_i), g_{r_i})\}$ *of type* T *on* $A_2(r_i)$ *with* $j(i) > 0)$ *for every* i*, converges in* C^Γ, $\Gamma \geq 1$, *to a flat product* $(I \times T^2, d\tau^2 + h)$ *where* h *is a flat metric in* T^2.

Proof:

Let $\tilde{\Theta}_\infty(\tau)$ and $\tilde{\theta}_\infty(\tau)$ be the (limit) second fundamental form and mean curvature on the slice $\{\tau\} \times T^2$ (or, the same, the second fundamental form and mean curvature for the limit metric $\tilde{g}_\infty$). Recall first from the elliptic estimates of Section 2.4 that the limit metric $\tilde{g}_\infty$ is smooth. Then consider the structure equations

$$\tilde{\theta}'_\infty = \frac{1}{2}(2\tilde{\kappa} - \tilde{\theta}^2_\infty - |\tilde{\Theta}_\infty|^2 - \tilde{R}_\infty), \tag{44}$$

$$2\tilde{\kappa} + |\tilde{\Theta}_\infty|^2 - \tilde{\theta}^2_\infty = \tilde{R}_\infty - 2\tilde{Ric}_\infty(n, n), \tag{45}$$

$$< div\, \tilde{\Theta}_\infty - d\tilde{\theta}_\infty, v >= \tilde{Ric}_\infty(n, v),\ if\ \ < n, v >= 0, \tag{46}$$

where $\tilde{Ric}_\infty$ is the Ricci curvature of $\tilde{g}_\infty$, the $'$ is derivative with respect to τ and $\tilde{\kappa}$ is the Gaussian curvature of the intrinsic metric to $\{\tau\} \times T^2$ and therefore is identically zero (because is T^2-symmetric). We see from these equations that the T^2-symmetric metric $\tilde{g}_\infty$, which has non-negative scalar curvature $\tilde{R}_\infty$, is a metric product if the function $\tilde{\theta}_\infty$ is identically zero as we would have in such case $\tilde{\Theta}_\infty$ and $\tilde{Ric}_\infty$ identically zero. We will show that it is not possible that $\tilde{\theta}_\infty(\tau_0) \neq 0$ for some τ_0. Denote $\tilde{\theta}_\infty(\tau_0) = \overline{\theta}$.

For any i we are going to consider a new manifold $\tilde{E}_i$. Every $\tilde{E}_i$ is constructed as follows. If for a given i, T_i^2 does not separate E into two connected components, then define $\tilde{E}_i$ as E cut along T_i^2, and thus having, besides ∂E, two new boundary components homeomorphic to T_i^2. If on the other hand T_i^2 does separate E into two connected components then define $\tilde{E}_i$ as the one containing ∂E. Note that, in the second case, $\tilde{E}_i$ has two boundary components, ∂E and another homeomorphic to T_i^2, that we will denote by $\overline{T}_i$. In the first case instead we have two connected components homeomorphic to T_i^2, that we will denote by $\overline{T}_i^2$ and $\overline{\overline{T}}_i^2$. It is important to observe that because $j(i) > 0$ for all i, $\tilde{E}_i$ still contains the end of E.

By changing τ by $-\tau$ if necessary (in the realization of the limit metric as $d\tau^2 + h$) we can assume without any loss of generality that $\overline{\theta}_\infty$ is the limit of the mean curvature of $\overline{T}_i^2$ in the outgoing direction to $\tilde{E}_i$.

To show $\overline{\theta} = 0$ we will prove first the inequality $\overline{\theta} > 0$ and then we will prove the opposite inequality $\overline{\theta} < 0$, which gives a contradiction.

i) - ($\overline{\theta} > 0$) Consider the set of all rays γ in $\mathcal{F}$. The set of their points with arc-length equal to d will be denoted as $O(d)$, and thus the set of their initial points will be denoted as $O(0)$. Note that there is $\epsilon_0 \leq Diam_g(\partial E)/2 = D/2$ such that for any two (long) geodesic segments γ_{e_1} and γ_{e_2} in $\mathcal{F}$ with $dist_g(e_1, e_2) \leq \epsilon_0$ then $dist(\gamma_{e_1}(D), \gamma_{e_2}(D)) \leq D/2$. This implies in particular that the distance between $\gamma_{e_1}(d_1)$ and $\gamma_{e_2}(d_2)$, with $d_1 \geq D$ and $d_2 \geq D$ is less or equal than $d_1 + d_2 - (3/2)D$. In particular there is a smooth geodesic segment joining the points $\gamma_{e_1}(d_1)$ and $\gamma_{e_2}(d_2)$, not touching ∂E and realizing the distance between them. Proceeding by contradiction one easily shows that for any given $\epsilon_0 > 0$, there is r_{ϵ_0} such that the base point of a $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}$ with length greater than r_{ϵ_0} is ϵ_0-close in the metric g to a point in $O(0)$.

Recall that, as the convergence of $(\tilde{U}_j(r_i), \tilde{g}_{r_i})$ to $(I \times T^2, \tilde{g}_\infty)$ is in C^Γ for any $\Gamma \geq 1$, then there is a sequence of smooth tori T_i^2 embedded in $\tilde{U}_j(r_i)$ whose mean curvatures, $\tilde{\theta}_i$, converge pointwise to the constant $\overline{\theta}$.

Let $\{d_i\}$ be a divergent sequence such that $\{d_i/r_i\}$ is also divergent. We show now that, for i large enough, there is a smooth geodesic segment ξ_i inside $\tilde{E}_i$ joining $O(d_i)$ and $\overline{T}_i^2$, realizing the distance, inside $\tilde{E}_i$, between these two sets and not touching $\partial\overline{E}_i$ other than at $\overline{T}_i^2$. For the rest of the paragraph, distances among points or sets will be taken inside $\tilde{E}_i$. Observe that any ray will intersect $U_0(\partial E, r_i)$ only in a connected segment (if γ is a ray, then $dist(\gamma(s), \partial E) = s$). Observe too that because of this $dist(\overline{T}_i^2, O(d_i)) > 0$. Let q_i be a point on $\overline{T}_i^2$ such that $dist(q_i, O(d_i)) = dist(\overline{T}_i^2, O(d_i))$. We note first that a curve, not necessarily smooth, realizing the distance $dist(\overline{T}_i^2, O(d_i))$ inside $\tilde{E}_i$ cannot touch $\overline{\overline{T}}_i^2$ in the case that $\tilde{E}_i$ has that boundary component too. To see this (briefly), note that, as seen from the metric g_{r_i}, the region in $\tilde{E}_i$ "before" T_i^2 is becoming, roughly speaking, a "thinner and thinner" tube of the form $\approx I' \times T^2$. Namely the transversal tori collapse, while its diameter is kept bounded below away from zero, namely the "length" of I' stays away from zero. It is simple to see that a curve entering and leaving this region and touching $\overline{\overline{T}}_i^2$ cannot be length minimizing if i is big enough, that is, if the transversal tori are sufficiently g_{r_i}-collapsed. On the other hand, if a curve, not necessarily smooth, realizing $dist(q_i, O(d_i))$ and joining q_i to $O(d_i)$ touches ∂E, then, naturally, the part joining q_i to ∂E is the part of a geodesic γ_{e_q}. Note too that in this case $dist(q_i, O(d_i)) \geq d_i + dist(q_i, \partial E)$. If i is big enough then the initial point e_q is ϵ_0-close to a point e in $O(0)$. From the discussion we had before we have $dist(q_i, O(d_i)) \leq dist(q_i, \gamma_e(d_i)) \leq d_i + dist(q_i, \partial E) - (3/2)D$ which is a contradiction.

Note now that, because d_i/r_i diverges, the g_{r_i}-length of ξ_i goes to infinity and note too that ξ_i is perpendicular to $\overline{T}_i^2$. If $\overline{\theta} > 0$, and if i is big enough we have $\theta_i \geq \overline{\theta}/2$. Therefore from the focusing equation we deduce that the g_{r_i}-length of ξ_i cannot be greater than $4/\overline{\theta}$ (note that ξ_i starts at $\overline{T}_i^2$ by pointing inwards to $\tilde{E}$) which gives a contradiction.

Observe that because the definition of $\overline{T}_i^2$ and $\overline{T}_i^1$, in the case T_i^2 does not separates E into two connected components, is arbitrary, the arguments above rule out completely this possibility. The next case therefore concerns only with the case when T_i^2 does separate E.

ii) - ($\overline{\theta} < 0$). From *item 2* of Lemma 3 we get that for any $k \geq 1$ there is, if i is big enough, a geodesic segment in $E \setminus \tilde{E}_i$ perpendicular to T_i^2 and of g_{r_i}-length greater than $2^k - 1$ (the T-piece becomes longer in the outward direction to $\tilde{E}_i$). Thus if k and i are set big enough and $\overline{\theta} < 0$ we can violate the focusing equation again. □

Lemma 4 (Cubic volume growth) *Let $(E, (g, \omega, \ln u))$ be a regular end. Then*

$$\frac{V(U(\partial E, r))}{r^3} \bigg\downarrow_{r \to \infty} \frac{\mu(\partial E)}{3} > 0.$$

Proof:

Assume by contradiction that $\mu(\partial E) = 0$. Note that we have proved the following in the previous Proposition 8:

Let $\Gamma \geq 1$. *For any* $\delta > 0$ *there is* ϵ_1 *and* r_1 *such that for any* $r \geq r_1$ *and any piece* $U_j(r)$ *(for* $A_2(r)$*) with* $j \geq 1$, *such that for some* p *on it with* $d(p) = r$ *there are two geodesic loops* $\mathcal{L}^1(p)$ *and* $\mathcal{L}^2(p)$ *with* g_r*-length less than* ϵ_1, *then a finite covering* $(\tilde{U}_j(r), \tilde{g}_r)$ *is* δ*-close in* C^j *to a space* $(I \times T^2, d\tau^2 + h)$.

Having this, define *a piece* $U_j(r)$ in $A_2(r)$, to be of type T (before we defined *sequences* of type T) if $r \geq r_1$ (r_1 as before), $j \geq 1$ and there are two geodesic loops $\mathcal{L}^1(p)$ and $\mathcal{L}^2(p)$ based at p with $d(p) = r$ and with g_r-length less than ϵ_1 (ϵ_1 as before).

Observe now the following concerning the length of curves that will be used in the next paragraph below. Let (M_1, g_1), (M_2, g_2) be two Riemaninan three-manifolds. Let $\varphi : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ be a diffeomorphism such that $\|\varphi^* g_2 - g_1\|_{g_1} \leq \delta$ pointwise. Thus for any point p in M_1 and unit vector v in T_pM_1 ($g_1(v, v) = 1$) we have $|\varphi^* g_2(v, v) - 1| \leq \delta$. Let $\alpha(s_1)$ be a curve in M_1 parameterized by the g_1-arc-length s_1. Let ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 be the lengths of α with respect to g_1 and $\varphi^* g_2$ respectively. Then we have

$$\ell_2 = \int \sqrt{\varphi^* g_2(\alpha', \alpha')} ds_1 = \int \sqrt{1 + (\varphi^* g_2 - g_1)(\alpha', \alpha')} ds_1 \leq \sqrt{1 + \delta}\ell_1.$$

Similarly one has $\sqrt{1 - \delta}\ell_1 \leq \ell_2$. Thus we obtain

$$(1 - \delta)\ell_1 \leq \ell_2 \leq (1 + \delta)\ell_1. \tag{47}$$

We claim now that for any divergent sequence $\{r_i\}$ (where the first element is greater or equal than r_1 (r_1 as before)) none of the pieces $U_j(r_i)$, $j = 1, \ldots, m(r_i)$ is of type T, where in the definition of type T we take (for instance) $\delta = 1/4$. We show this in what follows. If for r_l the piece $(U_j(r_l), g_{r_l})$ is of type T then for any point q_l with $d(q_l) = 2r_l$ (note the distance is equal to $2r_l$) we show below that one can (rather simply) construct two geodesic loops $\mathcal{L}_l^1(q_l)$ and $\mathcal{L}_l^2(q_l)$ with g_{2r_l}-length less than ϵ_1. After having this, it follows that the piece $(U_j(2r_l), g_{2r_l})$ has to be of type T too. Proceeding in the same fashion, and, after the concatenation of all the pieces, deduce that E must have a second end homeomorphic to $T^2 \times [0, \infty)$, which gives a contradiction. It remains thus to explain the construction of the geodesic loops. Let $\varphi : I \times T^2 \rightarrow \tilde{U}_j(r_l)$ be a diffeomorphism such that $\varphi^* \tilde{g}_{r_l}$ is δ-close in C^1 to the T^2-symmetric metric $dx^2 + h$ (see definition of Type T piece). Consider $q_l^* = \varphi^{-1}(q_l)$ and consider too the lifts of $\mathcal{L}^1(p_l)$ and $\mathcal{L}^2(p_l)$ to $\tilde{U}_j(r_l)$ which are going to be denoted with a tilde. Note, of course, that the length of the lifts are a multiple of the lengths of the loops. Then define the curves $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^1(q_l^*)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2(q_l^*)$ to be the parallel translations inside $I \times T^2$ of the curves $\varphi^{-1}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^1(p_l))$ and $\varphi^{-1}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2(p_l))$ respectively. Then the loops $\mathcal{L}^1(q_l)$ and $\mathcal{L}^2(q_l)$ are defined to be the projections into $U_j(r_l)$ of the curves $\varphi(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^1(q_l^*))$ and $\varphi(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2(q_l^*))$ respectively. If we take $(M_1, g_1) = (I \times T^2, d\tau^2 + h)$ and $(M_2, g_2) = (\tilde{U}_j(r_l), \tilde{g}_{r_l})$, in the description of the length of curves above, and apply (47) (twice) one obtains easily

$$\ell_2(\varphi(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^a(q_l)) \leq \frac{1+\delta}{1-\delta}\ell_2(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^a(p_l)),\ a = 1, 2.$$

Therefore one obtains (change notation now from ℓ_2 to ℓ_{r_l})

$$\ell_{r_l}(\mathcal{L}^a(q_l)) \leq \frac{1+\delta}{1-\delta}\ell_{r_l}(\mathcal{L}^a(p_l)) \leq \frac{5}{3}\epsilon_1,\ a = 1, 2,$$

and finally $\ell_{2r_l}(\mathcal{L}^a(q_l)) \leq (5/6)\epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_1$ (note the subindex $2r_l$).

Pick now r big enough and consider the set of pieces $\{U_j(2^n r), j = 1, \ldots, m(2^n r),\ n = 0, \ldots, \infty\}$. Naturally the union of all these sets covers E outside a compact set. For each n all the $U_j(2^n r)$, except possibly $U_0(2^n r)$, have one and only one geodesic loop collapsed at every point. Therefore if two of them overlap, their union is naturally a Seifert manifold (see Corollary 2). This fact is indeed crucial, because it shows that outside a compact set the end E can be thought, either as a Seifert manifold (in the case that non of the pieces is of type T) or as a union along necks of type T ($\approx I \times T^2$) of Seifert manifolds with at least two boundary components each. It is well known [13] (Pg. 432 Corollary 3.3) that any Seifert manifold with at least two boundary components is irreducible, in particular every embedded sphere bounds a ball, and that every toric boundary is incompressible (the π_1 injects). It is direct to see that these two facts imply that outside a compact set in E every embedded 2-sphere bounds a ball. This contradicts the fact that E is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$, because there are spheres arbitrarily far away from ∂E that do not bound balls. □

We are ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof (of **Theorem 2**):

We start by making two observations that will be used in combined form to give the result.

i) - We note first that if $\mu(\partial E) > 0$ then, because

$$\lim V_r(A_2(r)) = \frac{V(U(\partial E, 2r)) - V(U(\partial E, 2^{-1}r))}{r^3} = \frac{\mu(\partial E)}{3}(2^3 - 2^{-3}) > 0,$$

and because $m(r) \leq N$, where N is independent of r, then there is $\underline{\mu} > 0$ such that for any r (sufficiently big) there is always a $U_j(r)$ with $V_r(U_j(r) \cap A_2(r)) > \underline{\mu}$. Denote it by $\bar{U}_j(r)$.

ii) - Arguing by contradiction, one shows that for any $\delta > 0$ and $\nu > 0$ there is $r_0(\nu, \delta)$ such that for any $r \geq r_0$ and every piece $U_j(r)$ such that $V_r(U_j(r) \cap A_2(r)) \geq \frac{\nu}{3}$, then $U_j(r)$ contains a domain which is δ-close in C^1 (of course in C^Γ, $\Gamma \geq 1$ too) to a limit flat standard annulus $(A_2(\infty), g_\infty)$.

The idea now is to use these two observations to prove that once a limit annulus starts to form then a full cone is formed after it.

For every $\delta > 0$, we know by i), that if r is big enough, then there is a piece $\bar{U}_j(r)$ containing a domain δ-close in C^1 to a limit annulus $(A_2(\infty), g_\infty)$ and it must be $A(S(\tau = 1)) = 4\pi$. Thus, if δ is small enough then the g_r-volume of the annulus $\bar{U}_j(r) \cap A(r, (3/2)r)$ must be greater than $(((3/2)^3 - 1)/6)4\pi$. In ii) choose now $\nu = (((3/2)^3 - 1)/(3.2^4))4\pi$. Then by ii), if $r \geq r_0(\nu, \delta)$, the piece $U_j(2r)$ (note the evaluation $2r$) containing the annulus $\bar{U}_j(r) \cap A(r, (3/2)r)$ (considered before), must have $V_{g_{2r}}(U_j(2r) \cap A_2(2r)) \geq (((3/2)^3 - 1)/(3.2^3))4\pi > 2\nu > \nu$. Thus such piece $(U_j(2r), g_{2r})$ must contain a domain δ-close in C^1 to a standard annulus. We can therefore repeat the process and obtain a sequence of consecutive annuli extending to infinity. The union of the closure of such consecutive annuli is necessarily equal to E minus a compact set. This shows that if r is sufficiently big $A_2(r)$ has only one connected component.

It remains to show the decay

$$|Ric| + 2|\nabla \ln u|^2 + 2\frac{|\omega|^2}{u^4} \leq 2R \leq \frac{o(d)}{d^2}.$$

As we know the metric g_∞ of every limit annulus $(A_2(\infty), g_\infty))$ must be flat. However if $o(d) \nrightarrow 0$ as $d \to \infty$ one can construct a limit annulus which is non flat. This gives a contradiction. $\square$

3.2 Strong asymptotic flatness (Kerr-type of decay).

In this section we will prove the curvature decay $R \leq c/d^{4-\delta}$ (for any $\delta > 0$) which, as we discussed in the introduction, gives the standard asymptotically flat decay. We need some preliminary results.

Proposition 9 *Let (M, g) be an orientable Riemannian three-manifold with boundary $\partial M \approx S^2$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the congruence of length minimizing geodesics to ∂M, let*

C be the cut locus and let n be the velocity field. For $t < dist(S^2, C)$ let $S(t) = \{p/dist(p, \partial M)(p) = t\}$ be the equidistant spheres to ∂M and let $\bar{t} = 1 + t$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$ there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that if

1. *for all p in M*
$$|Ric(p)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{(1 + dist(p, \partial M))^2},$$
2. *for all $p \in S(0)$*
$$|\theta(p) - 2| \leq \epsilon, \ \ |\hat{\Theta}(p)| \leq \epsilon,$$

then for all $p \in S(t)$ we have

$$|\theta(p) - \frac{2}{\bar{t}}| \leq \frac{\delta}{\bar{t}}, \ \ |\hat{\Theta}(p)| \leq \frac{\delta}{\bar{t}}.$$

Proof:

Recall that the evolution (Lie derivative along n) of the second fundamental form Θ of the congruence $\mathcal{F}$ is given by

$$\Theta' = \Theta \circ \Theta - Rm(n, n), \tag{48}$$

where $(\Theta \circ \Theta)_{ab} = \Theta_a{}^c \Theta_{cb}$. Note the positive sign in front of $\Theta \circ \Theta$. Contraction of this equation gives the focusing equation (30). From (48) and (30) we obtain, after a straightforward calculation given below, the equation

$$|\hat{\Theta}|^{2\prime} = -2 < \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Theta} \circ \hat{\Theta} > -2\theta |\hat{\Theta}|^2 + 2 < \hat{\Theta}, \hat{Rm}(n, n) >,$$

which hold along any geodesic γ of $\mathcal{F}$ and where $'$ denotes derivative with respect to arc length. Above $\hat{Rm}(n, n)$ is the traceless part of $Rm(n, n)$ ($Rm(n, n) := Rm(v, n, w, n)$). Indeed, recalling $h' = 2\Theta$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta}' &= \Theta \circ \Theta - Rm(n, n) - (-\frac{\theta^2}{2} - |\hat{\Theta}|^2 - Ric(n, n))\frac{h}{2} - \theta\Theta, \\ &= \hat{\Theta} \circ \hat{\Theta} + \frac{|\hat{\Theta}|^2}{2} h - \hat{Rm}(n, n). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}|\hat{\Theta}|^{2\prime} &= 2 < \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Theta}' > -4 < \Theta, \hat{\Theta} \circ \hat{\Theta} > \\ &= 2 < \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Theta} \circ \hat{\Theta} + \frac{|\hat{\Theta}|^2}{2} h - \hat{Rm}(n,n) > -4 < \Theta, \hat{\Theta} \circ \hat{\Theta} > \\ &= -2 < \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Theta} \circ \hat{\Theta} > -2 < \hat{Rm}(n,n), \hat{\Theta} > -2\theta |\hat{\Theta}|^2.\end{aligned}$$

which finish the calculation. Thus we have the system

$$|\hat{\Theta}|^{2\prime} = -2 < \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Theta} \circ \hat{\Theta} > -2\theta|\hat{\Theta}|^2 + 2 < \hat{\Theta}, \hat{Rm}(n,n) >, \tag{49}$$

$$\theta' = -\frac{\theta^2}{2} - |\hat{\Theta}|^2 - Ric(n,n), \tag{50}$$

These equations give right away the inequalities

$$|\hat{\Theta}|^{2\prime} \leq 2|\hat{\Theta}|^3 - 2\theta|\hat{\Theta}|^2 + 2|\hat{\Theta}||\hat{Rm}(n,n)|, \tag{51}$$

$$-\frac{\theta^2}{2} - |\hat{\Theta}|^2 - |Ric(n,n)| \leq \theta' \leq -\frac{\theta^2}{2}. \tag{52}$$

In what follows we will analyze these inequalities assuming, for a given but arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, the a priori assumptions on the norm of the Ricci tensor Ric given in the *item 1* (in the hypothesis). Let γ be a geodesic in $\mathcal{F}$, let s be the arc-length from the initial point of γ at ∂M and let $\bar{s} = 1 + s$. Of course if $p \in \gamma$ we have $d(p) = s(p)$.

Suppose that $\theta \geq \frac{3}{2\bar{s}}$. Using this and the curvature decay in *item 1* (in the hypothesis) inside (51) we get the differential inequality

$$|\hat{\Theta}|^{2\prime} \leq 2|\hat{\Theta}|^3 - \frac{3}{\bar{s}}|\hat{\Theta}|^2 + \frac{2\epsilon}{\bar{s}^2}|\hat{\Theta}|. \tag{53}$$

Consider now the first order ODE

$$x^{2\prime} = 2x^3 - \frac{3}{\bar{s}}x^2 + \frac{2\epsilon}{\bar{s}^2}x. \tag{54}$$

Note that this ODE is obtained by making $x = |\hat{\Theta}|$ in (53) and changing the inequality for an equality. Substitute now in this equation $x = a_\pm/\bar{s}$, where $a_\pm$ is a constant that we assume to be different from zero. One obtains

$$-2a_\pm^2 \frac{1}{\bar{s}^3} = (2a_\pm^3 - 3a_\pm^2 + 2\epsilon a_\pm)\frac{1}{\bar{s}^3}. \tag{55}$$

Canceling the factor $a_\pm/(\bar{s}^3)$ and solving for $a_\pm$ one obtains finally that $x = a_\pm/\bar{s}$ ($a_\pm \neq 0$) is a solution to (54) iff $a_\pm$ satisfies

$$a_\pm = \frac{1}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - 4\epsilon}.$$

Note that $a_- > 0$ and $a_- \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. The important observation here is that, under the condition $\theta \geq \frac{3}{2\bar{s}}$, the solution $a_-/\bar{s}$ (to (55)) acts as an upper barer for any solution ($|\hat{\Theta}|$) to (49) that lies below a_- at the initial point ($\bar{s} = 1$). Therefore we obtained the following *first conclusion*

(I) *Let* $(\hat{\Theta}, \theta)$ *be a solution to (49)-(50) with* $|\hat{\Theta}|(1) \leq a_-$. *Then* $|\hat{\Theta}| \leq a_-/\bar{s}$, $\bar{s} \geq 1$, *as long as* $\theta \geq 3/(2\bar{s})$.

Suppose now that $|\hat{\Theta}| \leq a_-/s$. Using this and the curvature decay of *item 1* (in the hypothesis), in the inequality (52) get

$$\theta' \geq -\frac{\theta^2}{2} - \frac{(a_-^2 + \epsilon)}{s^2}. \tag{56}$$

Consider now the first order ODE

$$x' = -\frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{(a_-^2 + \epsilon)}{s^2}. \tag{57}$$

Note that this ODE is obtained by making $x = \theta$ in (56) and changing the inequality by an equality. substitute now in this ODE $x = b_\pm/\bar{s}$ where $b_\pm$ is a constant. We obtain

$$-b_\pm \frac{1}{\bar{s}^2} = (-\frac{b_\pm^2}{2} - (a_-^2 + \epsilon))\frac{1}{\bar{s}^2}.$$

Canceling the factor $1/\bar{s}^2$ and solving for $b_\pm$ we obtain that $b_\pm/\bar{s}$ is a solution to (57) iff $b_\pm$ satisfies

$$b_\pm = 1 \pm \sqrt{1 - 2(a_-^2 + \epsilon)}.$$

Note that $b_+ < 2$ and $b_+ \to 2$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. The important observation here is that under the condition $|\hat{\Theta}| \leq a_-/\bar{s}$ the solution (to (57)) acts as a lower barer for any solution (θ) to (50) that lies above b_+ at the initial point $\bar{s} = 1$). Therefore we obtained the following *second conclusion*

(II) *Let* $(|\hat{\Theta}|, \theta)$ *be a solution to (49)-(50) with* $\theta(1) \geq b_+$. *Then* $\theta \geq b_+/\bar{s}$, $\bar{s} \geq 1$, *as long as* $|\hat{\Theta}| \leq a_-/\bar{s}$.

Assume that ϵ is small enough that we have $b_+ > 3/2$. We claim now that if in addition the initial data to (49)-(50) satisfies $\theta(1) \geq b_+$ and $|\hat{\Theta}|(1) \leq a_-$ then $\theta \geq b_+/\bar{s}$ and $|\hat{\Theta}| \leq a_-/\bar{s}$ for all $\bar{s} \geq 1$. We explain this in what follows. According to the *second conclusion* to violate $\theta \geq b_+/\bar{s}$ at some (first) time $\bar{s}_1 > 1$ one must violate at some (first) time $\bar{s}_0$ before $\bar{s}_1$ the inequality $|\hat{\Theta}| \leq a_-/\bar{s}$. On the other hand, according to the *first conclusion* to violate $|\hat{\Theta}| \leq a_-/\bar{s}$ at some (first) time $\bar{s}_0 > 1$ we must violate $\theta \leq 3/(2\bar{s})$ at some (first) time $\bar{s}_2$ before $\bar{s}_0$ and therefore one must violate $\theta \geq b_+/\bar{s}$ at some time $\bar{s}_3$ less than $\bar{s}_2$. The claim thus follows.

The Proposition follows if given $\delta > 0$ we chose $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\delta > \min\{\epsilon, 2 - b_+, a_-\}$. □

We will use this observation in conjunction with the weak asymptotic flatness (Theorem 2) on the end E. Recall from Theorem 2 that for any $\epsilon > 0$ we can find $r > 0$ and an embedded two-sphere S^2, separating E intwo two connected components and satisfying

1. $1 - \epsilon \leq \inf\{d_r(p)/p \in S^2\} \leq \sup\{d_r(p)/p \in S^2\} \leq 1 + \epsilon$.
2. $|Ric_r| \leq \epsilon/(1 + dist_{g_r}(p, S^2))^2$ for all $p \in \bar{E}$ where $\bar{E}$ is the connected component of $E \setminus S^2$ not containing ∂E. Note that $1 + \epsilon + dist_{g_r}(p, S^2) \geq d_r(p) \geq 1 - \epsilon + dist_{g_r}(p, S^2)$.
3. $|\hat{\Theta}_r(p)| \leq \epsilon,\ |\theta_r(p) - 2| \leq \epsilon,$ for all $p \in S^2$.

From this and Proposition 9 we obtain

Proposition 10 *For any $\delta > 0$ there is $r > 0$ and a two sphere S^2 such that if for $t < dist_{g_r}(S^2, C')$ where C' is the locus of the distance function $dist_{g_r}(-, S^2)$, we make $S(t) = \{p/dist_{g_r}(p, S^2) = t\}$ then*

$$1 - \delta \leq \inf\{d_r(p)/p \in S^2\} \leq \sup\{d_r(p)/p \in S^2\} \leq 1 + \delta,$$

$$|\hat{\Theta}_r| \leq \frac{\delta}{t},\ |\theta_r - \frac{2}{t}| \leq \frac{\delta}{t},\ |Ric_r| \leq \frac{\delta}{t^2}.$$

Now, from $1 + \epsilon + dist_{g_r}(p, S^2) \geq d_r(p) \geq 1 - \epsilon + dist_{g_r}(p, S^2)$, it is deduced that the spheres $S(t)$ are at a $g_{r\bar{t}}$-distance less than $\delta/\bar{t}$ from $\{p/d_{r\bar{t}} = 1\}$ inside the annulus $(A_2(r\bar{t}), g_{r\bar{t}})$ that we know, if r is big enough is close to a standard flat annulus. Under these facts and the estimates of Proposition 10 the spheres $S(t)$ are seen to be embedded for all $t > 0$. Therefore the distance function $dist_{g_r}(-, S^2)$ is smooth for all and the level sets are spheres $(S(t))$ for all $t > 0$. Namely the locus C' is empty.

From now and for the rest of the article it will be more convenient in order to simplify notation, or better to take advantage of the notation introduced before, to use $\bar{E}$ as "the end E" and g_r as "the metric g" of the "the end E" (g_r as in the Proposition above). We let that clear in the following **Notation**.

Notation 2 *From now we will assume that the given end consists of the manifold* $\bar{E}$ *and the metric* g_r *as in Proposition 10. In order to avoid introducing further terminology we will still keep the notation* (E, g) *for such redefined end. Having done this all the rest of the notation continues as in the previous sections. All the symbology starts afresh.*

In this setting the following Proposition is straightforward out of Proposition 10 and the comments thereafter.

Proposition 11 *The distance function* d *is smooth and for any* $\delta > 0$ *there is* $r_0 > 0$ *such that for all* $r \geq r_0$ *we have*

$$|\hat{\Theta}_r(p)| \leq \frac{2\delta}{d_r(p)},\ |\theta_r(p) - \frac{2}{d_r(p)}| \leq \frac{2\delta}{d_r(p)},\ \text{for all } p \text{ such that } d(p) \geq r.$$

There is an important conclusion that comes out of Proposition 11. From

$$\frac{2-2\delta}{d_r} \leq \Delta_r d_r = \theta_r \leq \frac{2+2\delta}{d_r},$$

we get the inequality (assume $0 < \alpha < 1$ but $\alpha \approx 1$)

$$\frac{\alpha(-2\delta + (\alpha - 1))}{d_r^{2+\alpha}} \leq \Delta_r \frac{1}{d_r^{\alpha}} \leq \frac{\alpha(2\delta + (\alpha - 1))}{d_r^{2+\alpha}}.$$

In particular if α is chosen in such a way that $\delta = (1-\alpha)/2$ then

$$\Delta_r \frac{1}{d_r^{\alpha}} \leq 0.$$

Therefore, the maximum principle shows that the smooth function $d_r^{-\alpha}$ provides an upper barrier for any function Ψ such that

1. $\Delta_r \Phi \geq 0$,
2. $\Phi(p) \leq 1$ for any p such that $d_r(p) = 1$,
3. $\lim_{d_r(p) \to \infty} \Phi(p) = 0$.

This applies in particular to the scalar curvature R in the following way. Define, as before, the spheres $S(r) = \bar{\partial} U(\partial E, r)$ and let $\bar{R}(r) = \sup\{R(p), p \in S(r)\}$. From the subharmonic property of R and the a priori decay (33) it follows that $\bar{R}(r)$ is monotonically decreasing as r increases. In particular if $\bar{R}(r_1) = 0$ for some r_1 then it is also zero for any $r \geq r_1$ in which case the stationary solution is simply the Minkowski space-time. We will assume therefore that $\bar{R}(r) > 0$ for all r.

Make $\Phi = R/\bar{R}(r)$. We know from equation (14) that $\Delta_r \Phi \geq 0$. On the other hand we have that $\Phi(p) \leq 1$ if $d_r(p) = 1$ and $\lim_{d_r(p)\rightarrow 0} \Phi(p) = 0$. Thus, from the observation above we get

$$\frac{R(p)}{\bar{R}(r)} \leq (\frac{r}{d(p)})^{\alpha} = \frac{1}{d_r^{\alpha}(p)}, \text{ for any } p \text{ such that } d(p) \geq r. \tag{58}$$

This decay is the main result until now (of this section) and will be used fundamentally later. Observe that from it we deduce

$$\frac{\bar{R}(r)}{\bar{R}(\bar{r})} \leq \frac{\bar{r}^{\alpha}}{r^{\alpha}},\ r \geq \bar{r}.$$

Note too that this decay for R is far from the power of four we are expecting and note too that it is not the same as the decay (16). The desired decay is reached instead from analyzing the Ernst equation (13). We start the discussion below. We aim to prove first the next Proposition.

Proposition 12 *For any $k \geq 4$ there is $\bar{r}_k$ such that for any $\bar{r} \geq \bar{r}_k$ and $\bar{r} \leq r \leq 2^{-k}\bar{r}$ we have*

$$\bar{R}(r) \leq c(\frac{\bar{r}}{r})^4 \bar{R}(\bar{r}) \tag{59}$$

where the constant c does not depend on k.

Proof:

To prove this we are going to use the complex Ernst equation, but we will study is as if it were the *linear* elliptic system in

$$div\chi =< \zeta, \chi >, \tag{60}$$

$$d\chi = 0, \tag{61}$$

in the unknown $\chi = \nabla\mathcal{E}$ and where the factor $\zeta = \frac{\nabla\mathcal{E}}{u^2}$ will be thought as *independent* of χ. The system (60)-(61) is invariant under the independent scalings

$$g \to \lambda^2 g,\ \lambda \neq 0,$$
$$\zeta \to \zeta,$$
$$\chi \to \nu\chi,\ \nu \neq 0$$

Note for further reference that if we consider $\zeta = \nabla\mathcal{E}/u^2$ as constructed out of u and ω then ζ is invariant under the scalings $(u,\omega) \to (\mu u, \mu^2\omega),\ \mu > 0$.

Remark 4 *It is crucial to keep present that ζ, χ and g are to be considered as independent as we will consider the elliptic system (60)-(61) for scaled ζ, χ and g, but each of them will be scaled differently and in a way not directly related. In particular ζ will not be scaled.*

We will do that scaling in what follows. Define

$$\overline{u}(\overline{r}) = \sup\{u(p), p \in S(\overline{r})\},$$
$$\overline{|\chi|_{\overline{r}}}(\overline{r}) = \sup\{|\chi|_{\overline{r}}(p), p \in S(\overline{r})\}.$$

Scale χ and g as

$$\chi \to \chi_{\overline{r}} := \frac{\chi}{\overline{|\chi|_{\overline{r}}}},$$
$$g \to g_{\overline{r}} = \frac{1}{\overline{r}^2} g.$$

where the subindex $\overline{r}$ in χ indicates that the quantity has been scaled. The scaling for g is of course the same as the one introduced in Notation 2.1. It is worth to stress that the subscript $\overline{r}$ in $\chi_{\overline{r}}$ does not indicate that the scaling $\chi \to \chi_{\overline{r}}$ is induced from the scaling of g, $g \to g_{\overline{r}}$, for χ is not a quantity that scales if g scales (see Section 2). Nevertheless we will use the subscript $\overline{r}$ for χ to refer to the scaling above.

The elliptic system is now

$$div_{\overline{r}}\chi_{\overline{r}} =< \zeta, \chi_{\overline{r}} >_{\overline{r}},$$
$$d\chi_{\overline{r}} = 0.$$

We start now the analysis of this system. We observe first that $R_{\overline{r}} = \overline{r}^2 R = \frac{1}{2}|\zeta|^2_{\overline{r}}$. As $r^2 R \to 0$ uniformly over the annulus $A(\overline{r}, 2^k\overline{r})$ as $\overline{r} \to \infty$ (Theorem 2) we deduce that the coefficient ζ tends uniformly to zero over $(A(\overline{r}, 2^k\overline{r}), g_{\overline{r}})$ as $\overline{r} \rightarrow \infty$.

In order to have elliptic estimates available we will show in what follows that $|\chi_{\overline{r}}|_{g_{\overline{r}}}$ is uniformly bounded on $A(\overline{r}, 2^k\overline{r})$. We calculate for $\overline{r}$ big enough

$$\frac{R(p)}{\overline{R}(\overline{r})} = \frac{\dfrac{|\chi(p)|^2}{2u^4(p)}}{\sup\limits_{\overline{p}\in S(\overline{r})} \dfrac{|\chi(\overline{p})|^2}{2u^4(\overline{p})}} = \frac{|\chi(p)|^2}{\sup\limits_{\overline{p}\in S(\overline{r})} |\chi(\overline{p})|^2 \dfrac{u^4(p)}{u^4(\overline{p})}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\chi(p)|^2}{\sup\limits_{\overline{p}\in S(\overline{r})} |\chi(\overline{p})|^2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\chi(p)|^2_{\overline{r}}}{\overline{|\chi|^2_{\overline{r}}}(\overline{r})} = \frac{1}{2}|\chi_{\overline{r}}(p)|^2_{\overline{r}}, \tag{62}$$

where the inequality from the third to the fourth term (on the first arrow) follows, for $\overline{r}$ big enough, from the Harnack type of estimate

$$\lim \frac{\sup\{u(p), p \in A(\overline{r}, 2^k\overline{r})\}}{\inf\{u(p), p \in A(\overline{r}, 2^k\overline{r})\}} = 1, \text{ as } \overline{r} \rightarrow \infty.$$

From this and equation (58) we get

$$|\chi_{\overline{r}}|^2_{\overline{r}} \leq \frac{2}{d^{\alpha}_{\overline{r}}}. \tag{63}$$

This shows not only the uniform bound on $|\chi_{\overline{r}}|_{\overline{r}}$ but also a crucial decay as a negative power of $d_{\overline{r}}$.

On the annulus $(A(\overline{r}, 2^k\overline{r}), g_{\overline{r}})$ consider a function $\xi_{\overline{r}}$ with range between zero and one, which is zero in $U(\partial E, 2\overline{r})$, one on $U(\partial E, 3\overline{r})^c$ and with $\|d\xi_{\overline{r}}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}_{g_{\overline{r}}}} \leq c_1$ for a fixed numeric c_1 ($\overline{r}$ big enough). Recall we are making $\chi = \nabla\mathcal{E} = 2udu + i\omega$ and then performing the scaling $\chi \rightarrow \chi_{\overline{r}} = \frac{\chi}{\overline{|\chi|_{\overline{r}}}}$. Based on this notation we make

$$u_{\overline{r}} := \frac{u}{(\overline{|\chi|_{\overline{r}}})^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \tag{64}$$

$$\omega_{\overline{r}} := \frac{\omega}{\overline{|\chi|_{\overline{r}}}} \tag{65}$$

Also for any $\overline{r}$ consider a potential $\phi_{\overline{r}}$ to $2w_{\overline{r}}$ which is zero at some point in $A(2\overline{r}, 3\overline{r})$. Make $\mathcal{E}_{\overline{r}} = u^2_{\overline{r}} + 2i\phi_{\overline{r}}$. Let c_2 be an upper bound for $\|div(d(\xi_{\overline{r}}\mathcal{E}_{\overline{r}}))\|_{C^{1,\alpha}_{g_{\overline{r}}}}$. This bound can be set independent of $\overline{r}$ if $\overline{r}$ is larger than a sufficiently large number. We will assume that this is the case. Consider now the solutions ψ on $\mathbb{R}^3$, with $|\psi|(\overline{x}) \rightarrow 0$ as $|\overline{x}| \rightarrow \infty$

to the non-homogeneous elliptic system on $\mathbb{R}^3$

$$div\,\psi = \Psi, \tag{66}$$

$$d\psi = 0, \tag{67}$$

with $Supp(\Psi) \subset B(o,3) \setminus B(o,2)$ and with $\|\Psi\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} \leq 2c_2$. Using the Green representation and the fact that $|\psi|(\bar{x}) \to 0$ as $|\bar{x}| \to \infty$ we get the decay

$$|\psi|(\bar{x}) \leq \frac{c_3}{|\bar{x}|^2}, \tag{68}$$

where $c_3 = c_3(c_2)$ is numeric. If c_3 is less than 18 choose $c_3 = 18$. We claim that for any $\bar{r} \leq r \leq 2^k\bar{r}$ it is

$$|\chi_{\bar{r}}|_{\bar{r}}(r) \leq c_3(\frac{\bar{r}}{r})^4. \tag{69}$$

Note that, from the inequality (62) (observe that $R(p)/\bar{R}(\bar{r}) \leq 1$) and $c_3 \geq 18$, it is enough to prove this inequality for $3\bar{r} \leq r \leq 2^k\bar{r}$. Proceed by contradiction and assume that we can find a sequence $\bar{r}_i$, and $\xi_{\bar{r}_i}$ such that when we look $d(\xi_{\bar{r}_i}\mathcal{E}_{\bar{r}_i})$ on $A(3\bar{r}_i, 2^k\bar{r}_i)$, it violates the inequality (68). Observe that $d(\xi_{\bar{r}_i}\mathcal{E}_{\bar{r}_i})$ converges to a non-trivial solution of the system (66)-(67) on $B(o,2^k)$. Taking $k+1$ instead of k we can find a subsequence of $d(\xi_{\bar{r}_i}\mathcal{E}_{\bar{r}_i})$ converging in $B(o,2^{k+1})$. Continuing like this and taking a diagonal subsequence we can extract a limit $d(\xi_\infty\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ satisfying the system (66)-(67), with $|d(\xi_\infty\mathcal{E}_\infty)|(p) \to 0$ as $r(p) \to \infty$ (recall equation (63)), but violating the estimate (68) and thus showing a contradiction.

In exactly the same way as equation (62) we deduce for $\bar{r}$ sufficiently big

$$\frac{R(r)}{R(\bar{r})} \leq 2\frac{|\chi_{\bar{r}}|^2_{\bar{r}}(r)}{|\chi_{\bar{r}}|^2_{\bar{r}}(\bar{r})}$$

and therefore using (69) we obtain

$$\frac{R(r)}{R(\bar{r})} \leq 2\frac{|\chi_{\bar{r}}|^2_{\bar{r}}(r)}{|\chi_{\bar{r}}|^2_{\bar{r}}(\bar{r})} \leq 2c_3^2(\frac{\bar{r}}{r})^4. \tag{70}$$

Thus the inequality (59) follows if $\bar{r} \geq \bar{r}_k$ with $\bar{r}_k$ sufficiently large. □

Lemma 5 ((4 − η)-decay) *Given $\eta > 0$ there exists $c_\eta > 0$ such that*

$$R \leq \frac{c_\eta}{d^{\,4-\eta}}, \tag{71}$$

Proof:

Give $k \geq 4$. We will use the constant c (independent of k) as in Proposition (12). Let p be a point such that $d(p) = r = 2^{ki}r_1$, $i \geq 0$ and with r_1 in $[\overline{r}_k, 2^k\overline{r}_k]$. Then

$$i = \frac{\ln(r/r_1)}{k\ln 2}.$$

Applying repeatedly i-times Proposition 12 we get

$$\overline{R}(r) \leq (\frac{c}{2^{4k}})^i\overline{R}(r_1) = c^i(\frac{r_1}{r})^4\overline{R}(r_1).$$

The factor c^i is written as

$$c^i = (\frac{r}{r_1})^{\frac{\ln c}{k\ln 2}},$$

and with this we get

$$R(p) \leq \overline{R}(r) \leq (\frac{r_1}{r})^{4-\frac{\ln c}{k\ln 2}}\overline{R}(r_1) = (\frac{r_1}{d(p)})^{4-\frac{\ln c}{k\ln 2}}\overline{R}(r_1).$$

As this inequality is valid for any k and c does not depend on k we have proved the estimate (71) if we chose k such that $\eta \geq \frac{\ln c}{k\ln 2}$ and we chose $c_\eta = r_1^{4-\frac{\ln c}{k\ln 2}}$ afterwards.$\square$

4 Appendix

In this section we give some remarks concerning Lemma 2 in relation to **Lemma 1.3** in [2]. Although the comments are more or less of a technical nature, the situations to which they refer play some role in this article.

Proposition 13 *There is a sequence of smooth Riemannian flat three-spaces* $\{(M_i, g_i)\}$ *with non-empty and compact boundary, satisfying*

1. $0 < D_0 \leq diam_{g_i}(M_i) \leq D_1 < \infty$,
2. $0 < V_0 \leq Vol_{g_i}(M_i) \leq V_1 < \infty$,
3. *there is a sequence of points* $\{x_i\}$ *with* $dist_{g_i}(x_i, \partial M_i) \geq C_0 > 0$

such that any pointed sequence $\{(\Omega_i, \overline{x}_i, g_i)\}$ *where* $dist_{g_i}(\overline{x}_i, \partial M_i) \geq \overline{C}_0 > 0$ *and* $\Omega_i \subset M_i$ *(three-manifolds) collapses (in particular does not converge in any norm).*

Proof:

Consider the cylinder $G_\epsilon = S^1_\epsilon \times [-1, 1]$ where S^1_ϵ is the circle of diameter ϵ. Now, for any $n \geq 1$, we consider a planar domain, that we will denote $T_{\epsilon,n}$, and that is defined as the union of the sets

$$\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 / 0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y - 1 \leq \frac{1}{n}\},$$
$$\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 /\ 0 \leq x \leq \frac{\epsilon}{n},\ 0 \leq y \leq 1\}.$$

The base of $T_{\epsilon,n}$ is the interval $\{(x, y)/0 \leq x \leq \epsilon/n,\ y = 0\}$. The area of $T_{\epsilon,n}$ is $1/n + \epsilon/n$. Now on G_ϵ divide the circle $S^1_\epsilon \times \{0\}$ into $2n$ equal intervals and glue the bases of n-copies of $T_{\epsilon,n}$ to n alternating intervals in the division of S^1_ϵ. Denote the resulting space by $F_{\epsilon,n}$. Now define, for $i \geq 1$,

$$M_i := F_{\frac{1}{i},i} \times S^1.$$

It is direct to check that M_i provided with the flat product metrics satisfy the hypothesis and the thesis of the proposition. The checking is left to the reader. □

The example shows that the lack of convergence in the interior of M_i is due to a concentration of the volume along its boundary as i diverges to plus infinity. The key ingredient in the proof of Lemma 2 is to show that (under those hypothesis) the volume cannot concentrate entirely along the boundary of M_i as i diverges.

Proof (sketch) (of **Lemma 2**):

We will prove the following proposition from which Lemma 2 can be deduced from the standard theory of convergence [12].

Proposition 14 *Let (M, g) be a smooth Riemannian manifold and let $W \subset M$ be a smooth connected and compact (three)-submanifold with boundary such that*

1. $||Ric||_{L^\infty(M)} \leq \Lambda_0$,
2. $diam^I(W) \leq D_0 < \infty$, *($diam^I(W)$ is the intrinsic diameter of W),*
3. $Vol(W) \geq V_0 > 0$,
4. $dist(W, \partial M) \geq C_0 > 0$

Let $\epsilon \leq C_0/3$. Then there is a set of points $\overline{P} = \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$, $n \leq n(\Lambda_0, D_0, V_0, \epsilon)$, and a constant $\nu_0 = \nu_0(\Lambda_0, D_0, V_0, \epsilon) > 0$ such that we have

1. *$W \subset \cup_{i=1}^{i=n} B(p_i, 2\epsilon)$,*
2. *$\cup_{i=1}^{i=n} B(p_i, 2\epsilon)$ is connected,*
3. *for every i, $Vol(B_{p_i}, 2\epsilon) \geq \nu_0$.*

Proof (of **Proposition 14**):

Fix a point $p \in W$. From p we will construct $\bar{P}$. The construction is as follows. For given $\delta > 0$ (but small) find on $\mathbb{R}^3$ a set of unit vectors $\{v_1, \ldots, v_{m(\delta)}\}$ such that, if we consider them as points in the unit sphere of $\mathbb{R}^3$, then any point on the unit sphere is at a distance less than δ from at least one of the v_i's. We will need the following construction. Given p' on W_ϵ (W_ϵ is the tubular neighborhood of radius ϵ of W) and an isometry $\psi : \mathbb{R}^3 \to T_{p'}M$ ($T_{p'}M$ is the tangent space to M with the induced metric) associate a set $P(p')$ of at least $m(\delta)$-points in M consisting of the set of those end points that lie on W_ϵ of geodesic segments starting at p' in the direction of $\psi(v_i)$ and of length ϵ. Finally given a finite set of points A in W_ϵ define $P(A)$ as the union of $P(a)$ for all $a \in A$ (for every a in A the isometry $\psi : \mathbb{R}^3 \to T_aM$ is arbitrary).

Having defined this construction we define $\bar{P}$ inductively as follows. Define $\bar{P}_1 = \{p\}$, $\bar{P}_2 = P(\bar{P}_1)$, $\bar{P}_3 = P(\bar{P}_2)$ and so on until $\bar{P}_{[D_0/\epsilon]+1}$ where $[D_0/\epsilon]$ is the integer part of D_0/ϵ. Then $\bar{P} = \cup_{i=1}^{i=m} \bar{P}_i$. Note that $|\bar{P}| \leq m(\delta)^{[D_0/\epsilon]+1}$ where $|\bar{P}|$ is the cardinality of $\bar{P}$.

We observe now the following *Fact* (we will name it this way). Let q_0 and q_1 be two points in W at a distance ϵ from each other. There are $\mu_0(\Lambda_0) > 0$, $\delta_0(\Lambda_0) > 0$ and $K(\mu_0, \delta_0) > 0$ such that for any $\mu < \mu_0$ and $\delta < \delta_0$, if a point p' in W_ϵ is at a distance less or equal than μ from q_0 then there is a point in $P(p')$ (P defined for that δ) at a distance less or equal than $K(dist(p', q_0) + \delta)$ from q_1. This *Fact* follows after a straightforward analysis of the Jacobi equation (for Jacobi fields) along geodesics in M using the bound $\|Ric\|_{L^\infty(M)} \leq \Lambda_0$ (recall we are in dimension three where *Ric* reconstructs *Rm*).

We come now to the final argument to prove *items 1,2* in the conclusion of Proposition 14. Let q be a point in W. Let α be a curve inside W (not necessarily smooth) of length less or equal than D_0 starting at p and ending at q. For such curve there is always a set of points $\{\alpha_1 = p, \ldots, \alpha_k = q\}$, $k \leq [D_0/\epsilon] + 1$ in α, such that $dist(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}) = \epsilon$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$ and $dist(\alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_k) \leq \epsilon$. We can apply now the *Fact*, starting from $q_0 = \alpha_1 = p$, $q_1 = \alpha_2$ and $p' = p$, to find $p'_2 \in \bar{P}$ with $dist(p'_2, \alpha_2) \leq K\delta$ (note $dist(q_0, p') = 0$), then apply the fact to $q_0 = \alpha_2$, $q_1 = \alpha_3$

and $p' = p'_2$ to find $p'_3 \in \bar{P}$ with $dist(p'_3, \alpha_3) \leq K(dist(\alpha_2, p'_2) + \delta) \leq K(K\delta + \delta)$ and continuing consecutively in this fashion. If δ is chosen small enough one can apply consecutively this procedure k times (recall $k \leq [D_0/\epsilon] + 1$) to obtain a set of points $\{p'_1, \ldots, p'_k\}$ on $\bar{P}$ such that $dist(p'_i, p'_{i+1}) = \epsilon$ for every $i = 1, \ldots k-1$ and $dist(\alpha_i, p_i) \leq \epsilon$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Therefore $dist(p'_k, q = \alpha_k) \leq \epsilon$. As q is arbitrary we have $W \subset \cup_{p\in\bar{P}} B(p, 2\epsilon)$ and the *items 1* follows. On the other hand we note that for any $p' \in \bar{P}$ there is a set $\{p'_1 = p, \ldots, p'_k = p'\}$ in $\bar{P}$ with $k \leq |\bar{P}|$ such that $dist(p'_i, p'_{i+1}) = \epsilon$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$. The path formed by the concatenation of the geodesic segments $\overline{p'_i p'_{i+1}}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$ is clearly inside $\cup_{p\in\bar{P}} B(p, 2\epsilon)$ and starts at p and ends at p'. It follows that $\cup_{p\in\bar{P}} B(p, 2\epsilon)$ is path connected and therefore connected. This shows *item 2*.

We prove now *item 3* in the conclusion of Proposition 14. We observe first that for some $p' \in \bar{P}$ we must have $Vol(p', 2\epsilon) \geq Vol(W)/|\bar{P}|$. Now, from the standard volume comparison (with curvature bounded below [12]) we have

$$Vol(B(p', \epsilon)) \geq c(\Lambda_0, \epsilon) Vol(B(p', 2\epsilon)). \tag{72}$$

This gives a lower bound for $Vol(B(p', \epsilon))$. Thus there is $\nu_1(\epsilon, \Lambda_0, D_0, V_0)$ such that $Vol(B(p', \epsilon)) \geq \nu_1$. Now, as before, we consider a set of points $\{p'_1 = p, \ldots, p'_k = p'\}$, $k \leq |\bar{P}|$, such that $dist(p'_i, p'_{i+1}) = \epsilon$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$. As $B(p', \epsilon) \subset B(p'_{k-1}, 2\epsilon)$ we have

$$Vol(B(p'_{k-1}, \epsilon)) \geq \nu_1,$$

and by the volume comparison (72) (where in (72) we use p'_{k-1} instead of p') we get

$$Vol(B(p'_{k-1}, \epsilon) \geq c\nu_1. \tag{73}$$

Similarly $B(p'_{k-1}, \epsilon) \subset B(p'_{k-2}, 2\epsilon)$ and from (72) and (73) we get again

$$Vol(B(p'_{k-2}, \epsilon) \geq c^2 \nu_1,$$

Proceeding consecutively in this way one gets

$$Vol(B(p, \epsilon) \geq c^k \nu_1.$$

One finally can proceed from this lower bound on $Vol(B(p, \epsilon))$ to obtain a lower bound on $Vol(B(p'', \epsilon))$ for any $p'' \in \bar{P}$. This finishes *item 3*. □

5 Acknowledgements.

We would like to thank M. Anderson for the interesting discussions we had over the past several years on this and related problems. We would like to thanks too to J. Bičkár for interesting comments on non-vacuum stationary solutions and H. Friedrich for providing accurate references. Finally we want to thank Piotr Bizon for pointing out the Kaluza-Klein counterexample.

References

[1] Michael T. Anderson. Extrema of curvature functionals on the space of metrics on 3-manifolds. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 5(3):199–269, 1997.

[2] Michael T. Anderson. On stationary vacuum solutions to the Einstein equations. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 1(5):977–994, 2000.

[3] Michael T. Anderson. On the structure of solutions to the static vacuum Einstein equations. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 1(6):995–1042, 2000.

[4] Shigetoshi Bando, Atsushi Kasue, and Hiraku Nakajima. On a construction of coordinates at infinity on manifolds with fast curvature decay and maximal volume growth. *Invent. Math.*, 97(2):313–349, 1989.

[5] D.R.Smith et al. Weak lensing determination of the mass in galactic halos. *arXiv:astro-ph/0010071v1*.

[6] Kenji Fukaya. A boundary of the set of the Riemannian manifolds with bounded curvatures and diameters. *J. Differential Geom.*, 28(1):1–21, 1988.

[7] Kenji Fukaya. Collapsing Riemannian manifolds to ones with lower dimension. II. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 41(2):333–356, 1989.

[8] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, volume 224 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1983.

[9] Daniel Kennefick and Niall Ó Murchadha. Weakly decaying asymptotically flat static and stationary solutions to the Einstein equations. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 12(1):149–158, 1995.

[10] Peter Li and Luen-Fai Tam. Green's functions, harmonic functions, and volume comparison. *J. Differential Geom.*, 41(2):277–318, 1995.

[11] Zhong-dong Liu. Ball covering on manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature near infinity. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 115(1):211–219, 1992.

[12] Peter Petersen. *Riemannian geometry*, volume 171 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2006.

[13] Peter Scott. The geometries of 3-manifolds. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 15(5):401–487, 1983.

[14] Hans Stephani, Dietrich Kramer, Malcolm MacCallum, Cornelius Hoenselaers, and Eduard Herlt. *Exact solutions of Einstein's field equations*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2003.

[15] R.C. Tolman. Static solutions of einstein's field equations for spheres of fluid. *Phys. Rev.*

[16] J. Binney; S. Tremaine. *Galactic Dynamics (second edition)*. Princeton University Press - New Jersey.

[17] Robert M. Wald. *General relativity*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1984.